UNITED LODGE OF THEOSOPHISTS
BANGALORE CITY.

LIBRARY COPY

THE ARYAN PATH

Point out the "Way"—however dimly, and lost among the host—as does the evening star to those who tread their path in darkness.
—The Voice of the Silence

VOL. XXI OCTOBER 1950 No. 10

"THUS HAVE I HEARD"—

369

The sum-total of the experience of the sages of the world is available to s and would be for all time to come.

(*Young India*, 21st April 1921)

I have no desire to found a sect. I am really too ambitious to be satisfied vith a sect for a following, for I represent no new Truths. I endeavour to ollow and represent Truth, as I know it. I do claim to throw a new light on nany an old Truth.

(*Young India*, 25th August 1921)

These are Gandhiji's words. During his month, tomorrow to be exact, ndia will celebrate his Birthday. ot only in the political sense is he he Father of the Nation. Gandhiji ade himself a superb incarnation f the Spiritual Energy—Atma-hakti—of Ancient India. He la-oured not merely for the political eedom of the Country; much more d he work to make India once gain the Land of Good Works.

His spiritual programme of Satya-raha has been inspiring men and omen in other continents, and to-ay there are many thousands who ok to this country and to Gandhiji's nmediate followers to lead them on he way to Peace through Non-iolence—the Peace which a war-torn world yearns for, and the Non-Violence which men and women, young and old, ardently wish to hold in their own hearts and express in their own lives. Such have mentally perceived that hatred ceaseth not by hatred and that Love is the fulfilling of the Law.

It is the Religion of Gandhiji, not his political creed or even his social service programme, which attracts the thoughtful all over the world. The world is watching: how is Gandhiji's India shaping her home and foreign policy, for the redemption not only of India but of all mankind? There is disappointment, at home and abroad, that the political organization which he guided for over a quarter of a century has

failed to rise to its opportunities; that the once unsectarian and truly national organization is fast becoming sectarian; that the Congress Governments have so far not succeeded in following the immortal ideas of Gandhiji. Our great Prime Minister, Nehru, has set an example, however feeble it might appear to be, to adapt those ideas to the Foreign Policy which he is shaping. Satyagraha seems to inspire the Prime Minister, on whom the mantle of Gandhiji has fallen. There *are* sundry good omens in other Departments of Government, but they are obscured not only by nepotism and corruption but also by religious bigotry and political violence prevailing in the country. Communalism is the friend, however unconscious, of Communism, and these two are the enemies of Peace and Non-Violence, of Internationalism and Universal Brotherhood.

The most pressing need of India is a careful study of the Gandhian psycho-philosophy. How can Gandhiji's principles be applied in national life if they are not studied and expounded? As for understanding his philosophy, at least a few should *practise* his ideas for purifying and elevating their minds.

Those who talk of a theocratic Hindu State do so on the basis of a very orthodox and untrue interpretation of the Vaidika Dharma, the religion based upon the Vedas. Gandhiji, following the great example of the Buddha, tried to extricate that once pure creed from ritualism, meaningless mummery, false interpretations leading to abject superstitions and even to immorality. This is a fit occasion to remember and also remind our fellow-men that the Hinduism of Gandhiji is not that of the temples and priests, of rituals practised by the orthodox Hindus for the living and the dead, of absurd caste-rules in the matter of dining, marriage and untouchability. Gandhiji once wrote :—

> Hinduism is in danger of losing its substance, if it resolves itself into a matter of elaborate rules as to what and with whom to eat. Abstemiousness from intoxicating drinks and drugs and from all kinds of foods, especially meat, is undoubtedly a great aid to the evolution of the spirit, but it is by no means an end in itself. Many a man eating meat and with everybody, but living in the fear of God, is nearer his freedom than a man religiously abstaining from meat and many other things, but blaspheming God in *every* one of his acts.
>
> (*Young India*, 6th October 1921)

> It [Dharma] includes Hinduism, Islam, Christianity, etc., but is superior to them all. You may recognize it by the name of Truth, not the honesty of expedience but the living Truth that pervades everything and will survive all destruction and all transformation.
>
> (*Harijan*, 2nd January 1937)

Our Secular State need not and should not be an irreligious state. To it the teachings of Gandhiji should be nourishment. It is the Religion of Life founded on Knowledge, good works and deep devotion to the Cause of Human Brotherhood.

SHRAVAKA

WHY CIVILIZATION CANNOT COLLAPSE

[It is a reassuring conviction which the well-known author and journalist, **Mr. Hamilton Fyfe,** voices here. If humanity must pass through the waters of tribulation, it is good to feel sure that, whatever sufferings may be in store for many, all will not be lost. The fundamental values of human life do, of course, survive the crash of civilizations, because men and women have built them into their character, but inevitably another world-wide conflagration would destroy much that is of worth, along with superficialities without which men would undeniably be better off. Why must we learn the hard way what the real values are, when wide-spread recognition of the implications of being " civil " might yet avert disaster ?—ED.]

People talk glibly about civilization, its origin, its triumphs, the danger that a Third World War may destroy it. How many of them have any clear notion of what they mean by civilization ? Very few, I fancy.

May I offer a short statement of what it means to me and from that go on to explain why I am sure it cannot be destroyed ?

First, though, I had perhaps better say what it does not mean to me. I have noticed that most men and almost all women are inclined to take an entirely material view of what they call civilized society. They think they are civilized because they wear complicated clothes (as a rule more than are necessary) ; because they live in houses with water laid on and elaborate plumbing, because they switch on electric light or power, travel in cars on the road at 50 miles an hour and in the air at 500, watch cinema films, listen to radio programmes, sit in darkened rooms with eyes fixed on television screens.

They pride themselves on being more civilized than folk who dress very simply or not at all, who light candles or lamps, who habitually walk and, if they ride, ride in bullock carts or horse-drawn vehicles ; to whom the marvels of electricity are unknown. Each age boasts, and always has boasted, that it has scaled a higher peak of civilization than was reached by any age before. All ages have measured, as ours does, with a material yardstick. If there are more food, more furniture, finer dwellings, more amusement and more fashions that all can follow, there is more civilization ! Was not Disraeli right when he told the Victorians that they mistook comfort for civilization ? Was he not justified in asking, when he heard " progress " talked about, " Progress towards what ? "

That is a query Mankind has never been able to answer—so far as any goal on earth is concerned. The preachers of religion locate that goal in heaven, though none of them have ever described a heaven which

could be contemplated without a shudder. Plans for an earthly paradise have been drawn by social philosophers from Plato to John Ball, from Jesus to Gandhi, from Sir Thomas More to Bentham, Morris and Wells; but all their plans have been disregarded as amusing or annoying fantasies, treatment which so exasperated H. G. in his old age that he said, "Carve on my tombstone the words 'You damn fools, I told you so!'"

The downfall of what are called civilizations during the past 6,000 years (which are all we know anything about), has always been due to this refusal of humanity to look ahead, to plan for the future, to decide on the direction in which progress should lead. If Western civilization follows the rest now, the cause will have been the same. As G. M. Trevelyan says in his *English Social History*:—

> Man was provided by the Industrial Revolution with formidable tools for refashioning his life, but Man has not given the least thought to the question of what sort of life it would be well for him to fashion

with the result, in Lewis Mumford's opinion, that

> never before have machines been so perfect and never before have men sunk so low.

These and numberless other pronouncements have to many minds carried conviction that Spengler was right (though not perhaps for the right reasons) in recognizing the decline of the West and the inevitability of its fate, like to that of the cultures which preceded it, some two-score of them in Arnold Toynbee's reckoning. Graham Wallas, a penetrating thinker, spoke of it early in this century as "falling into ruins." About the same time G. W. E. Russell, a shrewd social observer, who as grandson of an English duke had every chance to study trends of behaviour, came to the conclusion as the result of much study that "we belong to one of the most corrupt generations of the human race. To find its equal we must go back to the worst times of the Roman Empire."

In most of the other countries which make up the area of Western culture—in France, Italy and Spain, in Germany, the United States and South America—can be discovered the same symptoms of disintegration and decay. The Scandinavian nations seem so far to have escaped infection in an acute form. All the others were indicted by President Franklin Roosevelt for failing to "cultivate the science of human relationships and the ability to live together and work together in the same world at peace." The fault, according to Lord Moran, head of the medical profession in Britain, lies largely in the "disconcerting innocence" of physicians, who know "so little about the working of the human mind and its many aberrations." As a result of such ignorance, Lord Moran says, people have not acquired "the art of living together either at home, where there is a

threat of civil discord, or abroad, where there is the menace of war."

Whatever the causes of the fear which Einstein says truly is felt throughout the world, there can be no doubt of its heavy weight upon all "civilized" peoples. Very few bring intellect to bear upon this phenomenon, dig down to its roots, analyze its deeper significance. The mass of humanity plod on, dimly aware of uncertainty about the future, vaguely afraid of threats to life and happiness, snatching at small pleasures and indulgences to give them an instant's forgetfulness. They listen dully to forebodings about the collapse of civilization without the power or the mental background to imagine what is meant.

What do those who mouth the phrase mean by it? For the most part they mean no more than that they stand to lose the rhythm and regularity of their existence, the positions and privileges, the security and comforts to which they are accustomed and which they regard as their right. You do not hear that phrase on the lips of those

> . . . who tread life's stage
> With weary feet and scantest wage,

doing the hard and necessary work without which community life would come to a standstill. Philosophers may dread with Bertrand Russell an era of "mental slavery." Scientists may raise voices of alarm at the possibility of restricted research. Poets and painters shrink from a political ban on freedom of expression. But in general it is from the privileged and soft-living that the forebodings come, from people who render no service to society or whose services could without loss or inconvenience be dispensed with. And they interpret civilization, as I have said, in a material sense. They think its stability depends on the maintenance of certain systems, social, economic, political, and of all the contrivances and gadgets which, following the use of steam power, have been lumped together as "progress" during the past 150 years.

Let me present another view of civilization. To me it means simply and literally "Being civil." Its derivation from *civilis*, the Latin word for one who possessed the qualities of a citizen, supports that view. What are the qualities of a good citizen? To be helpful, kindly, tolerant, law-abiding, peaceable, orderly. That to my mind is the essence of genuine civilization. If those qualities are absent in men and women, to call them civilized is a misuse of the word.

Apply this test and you will discover how often the word is misused. Is it civil to surround oneself with luxuries and write off vast numbers of fellow-creatures as deserving no more than a bare livelihood? To deny to others, as Walt Whitman put it, "the same rights and chances as myself—as if it were not indispensable to my own rights that others possess the same?" To "put oneself to bed" (I quote Tolstoy's searing epigram) "and not care

whether others have beds to sleep on ? "

Was the treatment of " untouchables " in India civil ? No more than was British behaviour to Indians, whether in public or in private relations. Have any nations, as represented by their governing men, been civil to other nations ? Haven't they almost always acted solely in what they believed to be their own interests (they were often wrong !), heedless of the rights or claims of other nations ? Have the white-skinned races been helpful, kindly, tolerant in their attitude towards people with coloured skins ?

Winston Churchill with the support of American, British and European opinion calls the Russians " uncivilized." They have shown themselves in many ways to be so. But were the efforts made by the United States and Britain to destroy the revolution against Tsardom at its birth—efforts instigated by him and approved by Europe—were they civilized in my sense of the term ? If those Governments had been helpful, kindly, tolerant, as their Peoples were prepared to be, the Soviet system might today be very different ; the world would not live in apprehension of a Third World War.

In matters of great moment Peoples are more inclined than their rulers, whether despotic or elected, to practise civility, and this brings me to my reason for being certain that, whatever may happen, civilization cannot collapse into universal barbarism. What we call civilizations may crumble, as they always have done ; but others have always risen to take their place ; and will do so again. The degree of culture which Goethe defined as " feeling the weal or woe of neighbours as if it were one's own " has never entirely disappeared. In dark ages there have always been among the unknown, undistinguished workaday masses enough men and women—not many, but enough—to keep alive the fundamental decencies, the habits of conduct and thought which alone form the groundwork of any true civilization.

These dark ages have in every case followed the downfall of systems claiming to be civilized because they had organized material aids to easy living and piled up a pyramid of artificiality so vast that it had to topple over and crash. During the periods after these crashes human existence reverted largely to that of animals. Culture of any kind must have been confined to a very few, but among the many contentment was probably greater than it had been before. Life at its simplest left little room for the exploitation of their labour, for the tyranny of rulers, for the miseries and enforced inhumanity of large-scale war.

Nor under these conditions was there less real civilization than in societies claiming to be civilized ; there may have been more if we can judge from reports on such primitive communities as have been studied in our own time. Henry Drummond, the 19th-century explorer, biologist

and theologian, told how in the forests of Nyasaland he found Africans without clothes, learning or religion, apparently quite happy. Havelock Ellis wrote about Polynesians in Pacific islands who observed willingly the rule " Share and share alike. " None went hungry if neighbours had food. They were clean in their habits (not like slum-dwellers in ancient Rome or cities of today) ; they respected old age ; they had no fear of death. If two tribes quarrelled and came to blows, fighting stopped after a few casualties and the victor paid the vanquished an indemnity so that there should be no bad blood.

That came pretty close, it seems to me, to real civilization—being civil ; and it was in the hearts of the people, their way of life, not a far-off ideal urged on them by preachers and politicians who made no attempt to practise it themselves. So during the dark ages it was among the people that here and there nameless apostles cherished and spread that plain, practical morality, summed up in *Do unto others...*, the Golden Rule which is the core of civilized behaviour.

Lonely scholars helped by preserving the literature of the past ; poets and painters, too, in later stages ; but the work was done by unlearned, humble, unassuming diffusers of the only light which pierces the obscurity of ignorance as to its origin and destiny in which humanity has always moved—and moves still.

If we have to contemplate the break-up of Western civilization, which is in so many directions the negation of " being civil, " of bearing one another's burdens, of doing as we would be done by, there is no need to fear that with the sham the true will disappear. If the human race can claim any superiority over other species, it must lie in the concept that to pursue the advantage of self is less conducive to happiness, both individual and general, than aiming at and working for the advantage of all. Many animals act unselfishly by instinct. Man can do so consciously and that concept has never yet failed in what we know of human history to keep true civilization alive. False civilizations may and must collapse ; it is better that they should. But the real thing is not collapsible so long as in some human hearts there remains any sense of the unchanging values which alone lend purpose and dignity to life.

HAMILTON FYFE

THE PSYCHIC VEIL OF THE SELF

[This short essay by **Shri C. T. K. Chari** is so suggestive and so full of valuable thought that we have felt that our readers would be interested in a note following and supplementing Shri Chari's article, bringing out some of the points which Theosophy presents in connection with those which he has made.—Ed.]

We are witnessing today a revival of interest in the psychic and the psychical to which the experiments in "Extra-Sensory Perception" admirably planned and carried out by Professor J. B. Rhine of the Duke University, U.S.A., and by Dr. S. G. Soal of the London University, have contributed in no small measure. Interest, of course, covers a wide range of attitudes and motivation; but few will deny that there is a steadily increasing volume of responsible literature dealing with the subject. The recent appearance of a periodical: *Enquiry*, designed to make expert knowledge of Psychic Science available to the layman, and sponsored by men like Prof. C. D. Broad of Trinity College, Cambridge; Prof. H. H. Price of New College, Oxford; Dr. C. E. M. Joad; Dr. William Brown and Dr. C. G. Jung, is a straw showing which way the wind is blowing.

Whether or no one cares to admit it, there has been, during the past few decades, a world-wide preparation for the new attitude. Theosophy and Spiritualism, whatever errors, follies, exaggerations and self-deceptions they might have been charged with, met on a common ground of rediscovery and faith. Neither, as it turned out, was wholly mistaken in its claim that there is an "occult" fringe of human experience which negates the categories of the materialist. The intellectuals and highbrows who tilted at popular psychism and insisted on the need for extreme caution and sobriety in dealing with the supernormal are in a more subdued mood today; for Psychical Research—or "Para-psychology" as it has been rechristened—has invaded those sanctuaries of science, the university laboratories.

The active presence in man of a principle superior not only to sense but even to ordinary consciousness is suggested by the most rigorous and controlled experiments. The wildest credulity has beeen replaced by the soberest credence. I do not propose to discuss the evidence here but rather the question of interpretation.[1]

I suggest that Psychical Research in its most significant aspect is the renewal of the quest for the Self. It is a quest no longer conducted on a basis of soul but on a basis of mind. The mind has proved to be

[1] *Vide* my papers in *Mind*, Vol. I. VIII, No. 230, pp. 218-221 and *The Philosophical Quarterly*, Vol. XXIII, No. 1, pp. 1-11.

altogether more mysterious than Descartes' *substantia cogitans* with its dubious residence in the pineal gland. It is dawning on us that the conscious mind is but the superficies of the Self. Beyond it lies a vast and complicated reality of whose origin, nature and possibilities science knows next to nothing. Our theories of the "subconscious" and the "unconscious" stop miserably short of the needs of the case. Psychical Research is a *Psychologie Inconnue:* a veritable probing of the deep mind; a study of unknown mental forces and potencies; of præter-conscious modes of knowing and functioning. The functions of the Self might not all be required for the purposes of a terrestrial or planetary existence. The "subliminal uprushes" we call telepathy, clairvoyance and precognition are in all probability obscure indications of an aspect of the Self that transcends the metrical universe of space-time. And as there is a Psychic Veil of the Self undrawn in these paranormal experiences, there is a Spiritual Veil removed only in the deepest ecstasy. What needs to be more widely recognized is that the path of intellectual enquiry does not bring us to the highest grades of mind and reality. They can be discerned, not with the candle of science, but with the torch of vision. Mysticism, high mysticism, is no outmoded philosophy.

That the psychical is far more subtly interwoven with the mystical than most "parapsychologists" imagine or admit must be evident from the lives of great saints. Consider, for instance, St. Catherine of Siena, that strange visionary who brought light and love to her contemporaries in 14th-century Italy. Well-attested accounts tell us that she was often aware of the thoughts and deeds of her absent "children." When Francesco Malavolti, the aristocrat, lapsed into a sin "known only to God," Catherine at once divined it and brought him to penitence. "Then, when I heard her tell me precisely all that I had done and said, confused and shameful, and without other answer, at once and heedfully I fulfilled her command."[1] "Extra-Sensory Perception"? Yes; but little more than a flash in the strange chiaroscuro of Catherine Benincasa's mind. In her *Divine Dialogue,* said to have been dictated in an ecstasy, she observed that the soul is a tree that should grow in the "circle of true self-knowledge" which has "neither beginning nor end." The blaze of "Uncreated Light" that enveloped the saint in her moments of mystical exaltation is a more stupendous fact than her telepathy or telegnosis, baffling as that appears to our psychology. "This mode of life," Apollonius of Tyana said, "produces such an acuteness of the senses, or some other power, that the greatest and most remarkable things may be performed."

[1] Evelyn Underhill, *The Mystics of the Church,* p. 156. *Cf.* Vida D. Scudder, *The Disciple of a Saint* and *St. Catherine of Siena as seen in her Letters.*

The Self revealed in mystical experience is a weird and thought-shattering reality. The German *Geist*, imperfectly rendered as "Spirit," is applicable to it. It cannot be compassed in the categories of the material. It transcends the horizons of our earthly sunsets. It opens up abysses which swallow up the limitless spaces of the universe and its æons of time. The psychical in its most sublimated aspect is but a pointer to it. "Heaven ghostly is as nigh down as up and up as down," as the author of *The Cloud of Unknowing* put it quaintly. And "the high and the best way thither is run by desires and not by paces of feet."

C. T. K. CHARI

A NOTE ON THE ABOVE

Shri C. T. K. Chari does well to recognize in his pregnant article that "the conscious mind is but the superficies of the Self," if indeed it be not better defined as the instrument of the latter; as also to distinguish between the psychic and the spiritual, so commonly confused. The distinction which he draws between the psychic and the spiritual veils is overwhelmingly supported by the evidence.

A few points suggested in Shri Chari's article may be amplified or clarified from the stand-point of the accumulated wisdom of the ages which modern Theosophy reformulates. It may be mentioned in passing that no charges of "errors, follies, exaggerations and self-deceptions" have ever justifiably been brought against Theosophy as restated by Madame H. P. Blavatsky, or against those basing their writings strictly on that philosophy, however justly such charges might be levelled against irresponsible individuals and their vagaries unfairly fathered on Theosophy. And the approach of genuine Theosophy to the problems of psychical research and spiritual practice is not one of "faith" but of reverifiable knowledge.

Spiritualism and the psychical research of the last century, presenting and chronicling occurrences inexplicable in terms of physical science, had a great opportunity to turn the world from materialism. That the Spiritualists fell into mere wonder-seeking credulity and failed to offer a philosophy worthy of the name, while the psychical researchers until very recently contented themselves with the accumulation of unexplained data on phenomena, was the world's loss.

The recent scientific investigations in parapsychology, testing telepathy, clairvoyance, precognition, psychokinesis, under laboratory conditions, seem to promise better things but the investigators must be on their guard against drifting into the endless repetition of experiments without relating them to the laws which govern the occurrence of phenomena and thus repeating the sterile record

of the Society for Psychical Research.

That occult phenomena would be taken within the domain of exact science was predicted by Madame Blavatsky as long ago as 1881. There is no room for miracle in a universe of law, so all causes must be natural though not all are wholly physical. It is to those believed to fall in the latter category that the term "occult" is in practice assigned.

Particularly hopeful in the present phase of psychical research are the urge to find "fruitful hypotheses" and the fact that not a few of those suggested are related to the psychology of the ancient East, if not indeed inspired by its explanations, repeated in modern Theosophy. For a complete and all-embracing philosophy lies behind the Occult Science of the East, including exact information on much of which Western psychology is hardly cognizant, *e.g.*, the various states of human consciousness, embodied and disembodied; the rôle of the imagination and that of glamour in psychic phenomena; the duration and effect of impressions; the fact that mediumship involves a physiological and nervous disorganization resulting in a pathological condition; the grave dangers in exploiting psychic powers for gain.

But what are some of the hypotheses now being put forward which bring the modern experimenters and thinkers along these lines towards ancient Eastern thought?

In *Experimental Metaphysics* for January 1947, Mr. J. Cecil Maby suggested the bearing of electromagnetic conditions on the production of phenomena. The studies he proposed in the relation of electric and magnetic factors to physiological and psychic conditions would be a promising approach. Madame Blavatsky affirmed the large share of magnetic conditions in the production of mediumistic phenomena of physical type. She wrote in February 1881 (*The Theosophist* II. 98)

> ...if we give our attention but to the electric and magnetic fluids in men and animals, and the existing mysterious but undoubted interrelation between these two, as well as between both of them and plants and minerals, we will have an inexhaustible field of research, which may lead us to understand more easily the production of certain phenomena.

Mr. Guilfoyle Williams, at the Brighton Conference reported in the 5th issue of *Enquiry*, recognized the existence in man of a "psyche" outside the conceptions of space and time and suggested that it had not only the conscious and subconscious aspects but also the superconscious, correlated with mystical experiences.

Mr. Leslie Belton's suggestion in *The Hibbert Journal* for April 1945 that communion of minds may occur at the subconscious level points to another teaching of Theosophy. H. P. Blavatsky said in 1889:—

> There is a series of vehicles becoming more and more gross, from spirit to the densest matter, so that with each step

downward and outward we get more and more the sense of separateness developed in us. Yet this is illusory, for if there were a real and complete separation between any two human beings, they could not communicate with, or understand each other in any way. (*Transactions of the Blavatsky Lodge*, p. 138)

Prof. C. D. Broad suggests "a kind of invisible and intangible but extended and dynamical 'body'" besides the ordinary body, and that it puts forth "pseudopods," to touch and affect distant objects, an obvious parallel to the Theosophical teaching of an astral body interpenetrating the physical, and extensible astral limbs with which the medium can move objects within a certain distance.

The suggestion by Prof. Gardner Murphy in 1949 that one clue to the understanding of the paranormal is to be sought "in the relations between persons and not *in* the persons as such" is in line with the Theosophical teaching that telepathy depends on sympathy between mind and mind and the attunement of their instruments to respond magnetically and electrically to one another.

In 1939, Prof. H. H. Price, admitting the need—and the lack—of "a *comprehensive hypothesis*" suggested bravely if apologetically that the Far East might be able to "give us some help in framing a more adequate and genuinely scientific theory for ourselves." He told the S. P. R.:—

I do not think that we should be too proud to take any hints we can get from the mystical and occult traditions of the Far East, particularly of India.

His theory of the possible persistence of mental images apart from the mind of their author and their endowment with "a kind of 'force' of their own," varying with the intensity of the emotion at the time they were generated, is very much in line with the Theosophical teaching. He even posits an "ether of images" intermediate between mind and matter, which has an obvious resemblance to the Astral Light of Theosophy. Certainly without the acceptance of such an "ether of images" or the imponderable, tenuous medium which Theosophy explains interpenetrates the physical world, through which the influencing thought can be sent, it will never be possible to understand telepathy. The Astral Light with its images of all that has been thought, felt and done is necessary also to the explanation of clairvoyance and even of precognition, for its sensitive plate yields the record not only of past and present impressions but also those of things to come, the causes for which are sufficiently definite and well marked.

The voluntary, if blind, exercise of such paranormal powers as those under laboratory investigation should already have destroyed the illusion, propagated by Spiritualism, that the similar phenomena of the séance room are ascribable only to the agency of the departed. Theosophy presents abundant evidence that the

hidden powers of Nature can be controlled by man and paranormal phenomena performed, not blindly or involuntarily, but deliberately, with knowledge of their rationale.

If there are psycho-physiological human powers by which, acting in concert with occult natural forces, certain individuals can produce paranormal phenomena, does it not stand to reason that such powers must be latent if not yet patent in all men and that their quickening in an increasing number must mark an evolutionary development? At the present time, in fact, and especially on the American continent, Madame Blavatsky wrote, " psychism, with all its allurements and all its dangers " is necessarily developing; and she warned lest the psychic outrun the intellectual and spiritual development. For, alas, the educated class of our generation, like that of which she wrote in 1881, " seems to evince but a very rudimentary spiritual grasp while apparently developed in intellect to the utmost extent possible." The gap between intellectual power and ethical control becomes, in fact, with every year more painfully apparent.

The distinction, moreover, between the higher and the lower abnormal powers, is marked, moral qualifications being a *sine qua non* for the former.

Even clairvoyance is of two very different kinds.

Spiritual sight comes only to those who are pure, devoted, and firm.... All other clairvoyance is transitory, inadequate and fragmentary, dealing, as it does, only with matter and illusion.

The experimental demonstration of the elementary phases of Occult Science has, however, its definite value for its influence on public opinion and the evidence which it offers that the last word is not with the materialists. Madame Blavatsky wrote in November 1881 :—

If the dignity of the study of the hidden laws of nature were but recognized, and encouragement given to our youth to pursue it as their circumstances should permit, the result would be most beneficial. With the advancement of this knowledge the moral darkness of the world would be gradually dispelled, old superstitions would vanish, flimsy new theologies would be swept away, and a true and ennobling ideal of man once more prevail.

Prof. Gardner Murphy declared in 1949 :—

The moral effect of psychical research in breaking down classical dogmatism regarding the limitations of the human personality to the world of its senses, is beginning to be glimpsed here and there.

The full acceptance by orthodox science of the findings and implications of these experiments in parapsychology will call for an even greater reorientation of thought than did the revolutionary discovery of radio-activity towards the end of the last century.

A STUDENT OF THEOSOPHY

YOUTH AND ITS ELDERS

[The mutual relationship of youth and age has rarely yielded all that it might of benefit to both. "Crabbed age and youth cannot live together," Shakespeare sang in "The Passionate Pilgrim," and today perhaps relations are particularly strained, a situation to which fundamental differences in attitude as well as manners have contributed. Age need not be crabbed, nor over-sure the younger generation is headed for the rocks. Nor need youth be impatient of restraint dictated by the race experience, or over-sure, despite the sorry world they will inherit, that their fathers are all fools.

We bring together here, essays of East and West which have some bearing on this problem from the point of view of the older generation. **Mr. Faiz B. Tyabji,** retired Judge of the Bombay High Court, touches upon it only in passing and by implication in his study of Manners *vs.* Truth under the title "Manners Make the Man." Several applications of his thesis to this problem will, however, occur to the reader. **Lt.-Col. R. P. Morrison,** however, who wrote in our April 1949 issue on "The Symbolism of Truth," deals more directly with the age-youth relationship in his analysis of the causes for the dominant restlessness of our age.—ED.]

I.—MANNERS MAKE THE MAN

Atishe Zarq-o-riya Khirman-e-din Khahad sookht
Hafiz in Khirqa-e-pashmina beyandaz o berow
The flames of hypocrisy and pretence are intent
upon setting fire to the very harvest of religion:
Hafiz, do thou cast away this wool-woven garment of the
dervish—acknowledge thy error—and depart.

These words of Hafiz come to our mind on many occasions when we feel sorely tempted to exclaim against hypocrisy and pretence masquerading under the guise of good manners. We are inclined to wonder whether good manners ought to be despised and considered to form a particularly venomous form of hypocrisy or whether there is any truth in what was said long ago: "An olde proverbe sayth that good lyfe and maners makyth man."

We may pause to consider whether clear thinking, attention to the real meaning of words and a somewhat more careful analysis of ideas will also lead us to the view that good manners and courtesy must necessarily be based on insincerity. Vague echoes may then come to minds taking not the least delight in abstruse thinking, from the words of thinkers, ancient as well as modern, who trace back good manners to certain foundations needed for the

very existence of society. We may then remember that each individual member of society must have some freedom of action, and that liberty on the part of one means a corresponding degree of self-control and restraint on the part of all the rest, since freedom for each one can exist only when all the rest permit it to exist.

Good breeding and good manners imply that each member of society should exercise over himself the same degree of self-control that he demands on the part of all others, so that he himself may enjoy that degree of freedom of action which he considers his own due. In this manner a most delicate adjustment of liberty and restraint, of freedom and repression, is the foundation of society and of good manners. Good manners, so understood, represent the form in which the individuals constituting society are expected, in some respects and in some of their activities, to behave towards each other with due regard to that which promotes the utmost common good.

Ill-bred and selfish persons take advantage of self-control that well-bred and polite people, acting in accordance with the dictates of good manners, exercise over themselves. Having taken such advantage of the restraint that the well-bred person exercises over himself, the selfish person fails to exercise a reciprocal self-control over his own self. This failure need not be conscious. While we unhesitatingly enjoy the benefits that accrue to us, the mental exertion required for understanding the basis of the social duties that rest on ourselves may not come to us so naturally and the necessity for reciprocating with those of whose self-control and restraint we take advantage may never be realized. No thought may be paid to this point of view. A mode of action may be thoughtlessly adopted which is found to be the easiest and most conducive to our own desires and comforts. But whatever the reason or explanation, the failure to exercise the reciprocal self-control is as much a failure to pay one's debts as when the debt consists of a liability to pay back money and is formulated in a bond.

And yet it happens—and not on rare occasions only—that after we have so failed to pay our debts we take great kudos to ourselves. After we have acted discourteously or rudely, we claim praise for having been outspoken or courageous. We unhesitatingly claim superiority over those whose real merits we may never have taken the trouble to understand, or have been incapable of understanding and appreciating. We may never have paid a moment's consideration to the chaos and anarchy that would replace a well-ordered and smoothly working society, if no such self-control were generally exercised. It may, in the present context, seem absurd platitude to state this, but its truth becomes less apparent to us in moments of excitement, when we are less prepared to give play to our imagination, and to

realize that the very conduct which we applaud ourselves for would appear to us intolerable if adopted by others. If every instance of unmannerly conduct were followed by exactly the same mode of action on the part of all the rest, individual exhibitions of bad manners would be less in evidence.

Since no member of society can enjoy liberty in respect of any particular matter or course of conduct unless the rest are restrained from undue interference with him it becomes necessary that there should be some sort of authority or power for enforcing that degree of general self-restraint which is needed. In respect of a certain part of our conduct, the controlling power is the State, enunciating the terms of its control in the form of laws and itself enforcing obedience to them on pain of fine or imprisonment or even death. In respect of the less important acts of self-restraint the controlling power may be merely the vague sense of the disapproval of society in general, outrages against whose approval are repressed neither by imprisonment nor by fine, but merely by the less cordial treatment that the offending member in the natural course receives from those to whom his society becomes less congenial. The punishment for the offence may consist of a mere smile of amusement or of contempt, or may result in partial or even total ostracism. It is the rules whose breach is left to be dealt with by the atmosphere, so to say, of society which are called rules of etiquette or of good manners. These rules may consist merely of conventions adopted for general behaviour or may reflect the most fundamental principles of good life.

It has so far been assumed that there is for our present purposes no basic distinction between the dictates of law and of good manners or, to be less inaccurate, that the dictates of law and of good manners stand on the same general foundation: the welfare of society as a whole. This is no new idea. It has been well expressed in the metaphor that law and manners are concentric circles, the centre of both being the general good of the people for whose guidance they are meant—but that the radius of law is much shorter than that of good manners.

Some of the duties that men as social beings have to perform towards society as a whole or towards other members of society are of such vital importance that the State cannot leave private influences to define or fix their scope and to enforce their due observance. The State consequently legislates in respect of certain duties and avoidances, and its laws explicitly command their observance. Other duties the State considers of too trivial importance to be dealt with officially. In the case of some such duties it recognizes that the best sanctions and safeguards for them must emanate from other sources than the State.

It has also been assumed—a very large assumption, it must be admitted—that the general notions on

which society acts are reasonable and sensible in respect of what constitutes good manners and what conventions ought to be observed and enforced. Men are apt in this respect as in all other forms of activity to commit errors. Conventions are not intended to be made fetishes. But some men seem to bow down before them as though they were the supreme arbiters of life.

Some conventions, however, perform a very useful function. Some are needed for the smooth working of social life. They are a means of information with reference to the conduct that will be observed by the other members of society. This knowledge enables us to adjust our own behaviour and conduct. Thus the hours of sleeping, eating, meeting, etc., are conventionally fixed. This makes it easier to know what course to pursue in our dealings with others. It would be very difficult if we had no conventions of this kind: our complex society would not be able to function.

The forms and conventions between friends, acquaintances, relatives, parents and children, sisters and brothers, ought to be based, though they are not always so based, on common experience. They, so to say, express the conduct expected and demanded from normal or average persons. But they ought to serve a higher purpose. They ought to indicate the standard that should be attained. They may be made a most useful and sensible guide, just as, if they are blindly followed, they may be like the husk with the kernel thrown out. Some of us delight in throwing away the kernel and then complaining that what is left is only a husk. To such of us, conventions offer ready occasions for indulging in the delights of complaint.

But (for those who think over the matter) several conventions are of profound significance. For instance, the convention that you must ask your friend how he is, when you meet him, may become a mere meaningless formula. Its kernel may be thrown away and its husk ceremoniously presented for mastication. But to a person who has formed the habit of conducting himself intelligently, the question indicates that every member of society must educate himself to be sufficiently interested in his friend's welfare to make the enquiry about his health spontaneous and natural. For him the words are not meaningless. They set a standard of human sympathy. Habitually to omit making the inquiry is not a mere failure to observe a formal and meaningless routine; it indicates that the heart has been permitted to dry up at its source and to become concentrated on itself.

And these thoughts apply to most of the forms and conventions with which men are expected to comply. It is true that the etiquette prevalent in any place at any particular time must necessarily fail in fulfilling its function perfectly: necessarily so because otherwise it would not be the result of human action. At times circumstances have changed,

yet men continue to do what, in the existing state of things, has no meaning. For instance, it is well recognized nowadays that the young and inexperienced are much wiser than the old and decrepit! But several conventions based on diametrically opposite assumptions still raise up their heads as though they deserved permission to live. At other times etiquette follows the weakness of those for whose guidance she is brought into being: etiquette is snobbish, partial to the rich and hard on the poor: often an insufferable toady to those whom she is pleased to consider superior and a heartless bully to those whom she is so blind as to deem inferior.

When I see minx Etiquette playing such pranks my rod of correction I lift up with pomp and pride. But ofttimes, before the rod can perform its function, the still, small voice speaks in a whisper that causes a tremor to pass through me. I hear it say: "Strike: but remember how pleased you were when the same prank was played on a former occasion: for then the rôles were somewhat different."

Seeing me pause, the still, small one grows bolder and says: "Look also well at the child: dost thou observe what she has before her eyes?"

And, sure enough, I observe that she has put on my glasses.

"How canst thou expect her not to be blind or, at best, to see with the eyes of a snob, having thy glasses on? Hadst thou not better go to the oculist and get thee better glasses?"

And the rod drops from my hand and otherwards travel my thoughts.

FAIZ B. TYABJI

II.—THIS RESTLESS AGE

There are many young people today who think themselves "realists." They do not understand the restless urge from which they suffer, and which drives them relentlessly in the effort to escape from any form of deep thought. This urge is caused by the subconscious knowledge that their lives are superficial, and therefore unable to bear any examination.

The spirits of children and young people are less overlaid with matter than those of the majority of their elders, and so they are more directly affected by the turn of the spiritual tide. They sense the imminence of some great spiritual power, and their intuition warns them that the external personality has only a comparatively short time left in which to hold the paramount place in this world. Personality, in fact, which has been revered, and even exalted to the heavens in the supposed Tripersonality of Deity, must soon take its rightful place as the lowest—but far from the least important—manifestation of spiritual self-consciousness.

Young people of all nations sense

the near emergence of this truth, and they endeavour to stifle it by closing the doors of their minds against the inrush of deeper thought, plunging recklessly into a sensual existence which confines the mental processes to a very superficial circle of thought induced by a mad search for pleasure : or, when such " pleasure " begins to pall (which is usually very soon), by any pursuit which may provide a new thrill, even if it should threaten to end the external life of such seeker after excitement—as it often does.

Anything rather than pause to think for a few minutes, might be the motto of many—it might be written, perhaps, of most—young people at the present time. Cults, such as Nazism and Fascism, owe their existence to this personal determination to close the doors of the external mind to any form of spiritual truth.

The young of all nations would like to kill spiritual truth before it can emerge into externals. Why ? it might be asked. If the young are less enmeshed in matter than their elders, as stated here, they should be more prepared to welcome truth. This, however, is not the case, as any study of present-day life will illustrate. The minds of young people are certainly less encumbered with personal thought than those of the majority of their elders but, at the same time, they are apt to be more intensely personal because they are only beginning their personal lives, and therefore shun any truth which may tend to deprive them of the personal power and achievement which they feel are due to them as persons.

The personal thought-constructs of elderly people are, no doubt, more stable than those of the young, but the old tend to look back, to live in their memories of past achievements, and most of their illusions are gone. As the vital tide ebbs in their nerves they do not feel their personal egos so intensely ; and, as their thought-forms are less fluid, they are less capable of assimilating new ideas conveyed in the life flux, but distorted by the minds of youth to suit their personal needs.

These elders are apt to form their judgments from the outward manifestations of life rather than the inner, as they are survivors from a world in which the external personality had not yet begun to " give up the ghost. " They realize that some drastic change is taking place in the world around them, but they cannot instinctively sense what causes it, and feel sure that it must be evil in its origin, because all that they have been taught to deem evil has never been so obvious as in the present day.

Such survivors cannot understand that all this evil was in the world all the time, but hidden behind the mask of hypocrisy which all were forced to wear, consciously or unconsciously, to hide their actual thoughts from their fellows. Few were so pure or so good that they

could allow their secret thoughts to be known.

Old, and elderly, people, who can remember the "good old days" of the Victorian and Edwardian eras, are dismayed at what has come upon the world. In the days of their youth, none but the boldest spirits —who were not, in fact, "bold spirits" at all, but strong personalities—ever dared to question the voice of authority in Church, State, or family. There was a very definite and rigid scale of values. It was right to do this; it was wrong to do that; and woe betide the sinner if he was not clever enough to avoid exposure! That was the one deadly sin against Society. No forgiveness was possible to the sinner who could not keep his sinful mind decently clothed in the garment of hypocrisy.

There was as much evil in the world then as there is now, but the rigid moral code of those days kept a large reservoir of evil dammed up in the mental world until it accumulated enough power to sweep the dam away, and burst in a roaring torrent upon the external world, which would undoubtedly be overwhelmed by the dark flood if it were not for the pursuing and conquering flood of Divine light and love which is thus able to follow through the mental channel opened by the passage of the evil.

Youth is clear-sighted superficially, and quick to detect hypocrisy, even when such may be quite unconscious on the part of the hypocrite. They take a mischievous pleasure in unmasking their elders, especially when these are deploring the morals and conduct of modern youth; not, perhaps, realizing that they are thus aiding the emergence into external life of the power which, at the same time, they are trying to strangle in their own minds. Although clear-sighted outwardly, their inner vision cannot function because it belongs to that part of their minds which they shut off from their external consciousness by ceaseless activity in the body.

And because the clear-sighted youth of today can put their elders under the microscope, this ability gives them a "superiority complex" which urges them to pick out the diseased parts and ignore the healthy ones. They can detect the cancerous growths of hypocrisy in the brain, but not the soundness of the heart. If these elders were hypocrites, they were mostly unconscious of this, and many sincerely believed themselves to be devout worshippers and followers of the Christ, doing their share in the great fight against evil.

"Fight the good fight with all thy might" would no doubt have been their favourite hymn; and they would have been horrified had they realized that, in thus "fighting the powers of darkness," they were merely aiding those powers—by damming them up instead of bringing them out into the open and dispersing them in the light of the sun—to gather enough force nearly to overwhelm the world.

Herein lies the spiritual reality which lies behind the Biblical story of the great flood which swept over the world. This legend is supposed to relate an actual happening in the dim past of the world's history; but, like the other Biblical legends, its actuality is to be found in the mental world, where it is occurring in our own times. Water is the outward and visible sign of that mental world whose primary external expression is the atmosphere.

In the Biblical legend, "God" had foreseen the disaster, and warned Noah to build his ark in time to save a nucleus with which the life of the world could be resumed in better form when the great waters had subsided. And the spiritual "Noah" is building his mental "ark" today.

Realism might be termed the keynote of our present times: and the proof of this statement is to be found in the world of art. The author does not pose as a critic of the arts, but it should be obvious to the most superficial observer that the general trend of all forms of so-called art today is towards what is assumed to be "realism."

An artist would probably claim that modern art had no use for the cant and hypocrisy of the past. It holds a mirror to life, and shows the observer life as it really is, when the "varnish" has been removed, and not what the observer might like to think it. But the suggestion is made here that modern art does not hold the mirror to life, but merely holds the mirror to the mirror.

Elsewhere, the material world has been likened to a looking-glass screen which catches the images in the sun's rays and reflects them as their opposites: beauty becoming ugliness, and so on. And the so-called realism of modern art is merely a looking-glass realism which depicts the distorted shadows of life thrown upon the screen of matter: distorted to such a degree at the present crisis of the world's change from an outward to an inner spiral that their ugliness is abnormal, and almost shapeless.

This present abnormality is caused by the upheavals on the mirror's surface, which in turn are due to the seemingly Titanic struggle between the forces of light and those of darkness which marks the transitional stage. To make use of another metaphor, in which the looking-glass screen of matter is represented by a pool of water: the Angel has stirred the water in the pool, and all the mud which had been lying hitherto on its bed has been brought to the surface.

The stark ugliness in the paintings, sculpture, poetry, music, and so-called literature of today is not realism, but might well be described as distortionism, or freakism. The artists may, indeed, have a clearer vision than others, but they are as yet unable to penetrate further than the world of thought and so they portray the terrible conditions which at present exist in that grey world where the monstrous shadows of supposed evil gather.

Another indication of the abnormality which is inevitable when any world "puts about," to make use of an expressive nautical term, and from travelling outward into matter starts to travel back into spirit again —but not exactly on the same course that it took on the outward journey, which is why the word *spiral* is used to describe involution and evolution —is to be found in the dance music of our times.

Dance music, and methods of dancing, are perhaps the best indications of the emotional state of a people. When the full power of the external personality was at its height, the dances were formal and stately to the verge of pomposity. When it was past its peak, and the spiritual self-consciousness within was beginning its struggle for amalgamation with its outer representatives, the waltz was the favourite dance, because the waltz more closely expresses what might be termed "the dance of the spheres" than any other tune. Its motion is the very movement of life, spiral in form.

The discord of today, and the fantastic motions which accompany it—of which the "jitter-bug" is the most idiotic in the full meaning of the word—are clear indications of the clash of vibrations in the astral, or thought, world, which have led to the most appalling and universal wars in the world's long and troubled history. The so-called "rhythm" of modern dance music is indicative of that restless feeling which drives young people to ceaseless, and often purposeless, movement in the effort to escape from those deeper thoughts, from true spiritual states, which they feel pressing upon the closed doors of their external minds. The desperate attempt to escape from the super-consciousness (which is the self-consciousness of the embryo "Angel" within them) drives them to seek refuge in a primitive past.

Beauty is still to be found; but in present states it is hidden behind the serried ranks of the "powers of darkness," and it requires the inner vision to perceive it. Possibly there are still a few artists who can see with this inner vision, and penetrate to where Truth awaits the triumph of light; but if there are indeed such, their works will probably remain unrecognized until the new era is firmly established on earth.

Truth and beauty are "unfashionable" today. Grim "realism," so-called, reigns in the world of art and literature. But there is a vast difference between this realism and reality: all the difference between so-called good and evil, light and darkness.

This should be a time for prayer and fasting, rather than for the frantic search for personal pleasure and so-called "happiness." The Mighty Spirit of Truth, who comes to "make all things new" is even now at hand. "He that hath ears to hear, let him hear."

R. P. MORRISON

ASCETICISM

[**Shrimati C. Setubai,** Warden of the Maharani's College Hostel, Bangalore, corrects in this article several misapprehensions about asceticism. True asceticism, as she implies, is of the mind primarily, and the desires. It is the attitude of non-attachment or dispassion that is important and bodily practices without that inner discipline produce, at best, a useless sacrifice which is a crime of folly; at worst, a hypocrite. "He who remains inert, restraining the senses and organs, yet pondering with his heart upon objects of sense, is called a false pietist of bewildered soul."—ED.]

Asceticism may be defined broadly as an attitude to life that excludes bodily or sensual pleasures from the field of ultimate values. Before considering its specifically religious or spiritual significance, it may be helpful to consider its place even in the sphere of secular values. Every type of devoted endeavour, each resolute pursuit of an ideal, requires an element of asceticism. It is well known that heroes in the realm of fine arts and poetry have to "Shun delights and live laborious days" to fulfil themselves through creative effort.

In the social sphere, from selfless devotion to one's family to self-effacing striving for the larger purposes of the nation or of humanity, a certain ascetic neglect or even negation of personal comfort or bodily happiness is definitely called for. In the history of science too, the cause of truth has demanded of many a savant self-denial and sacrifice. Even lesser objectives like money-making or victory in warfare imply the asceticism of austerity and disregard of immediate physical enjoyment. Any high endeavour or uncommon achievement, then, presupposes a basic ingredient of asceticism.

In the religious history of mankind asceticism has been built upon one fundamental metaphysical principle. Man is considered to be essentially spiritual and supra-material in nature and the bodily frame which enshrines the spiritual essence is held to be a contingent phenomenon caused by some original sin or error. The goal of life is conceived as emancipation from thraldom to matter and recovery of the innate perfection of the soul. The only way to achieve this end is to reduce to a minimum the preoccupation with the needs of the body, and to liberate the inner life of the spirit through meditation and prayer. By such inward effort and withdrawal from physical interests, the spirit is supposed to expand to its natural dimensions and to gain the emancipating vision.

It is unfair to describe this outlook as a flight from reality or as proof of an ostrich mentality, for it is

natural and legitimate for the believers in the basic metaphysical postulate of the immaterial essence of man to look upon bodily existence as a life of delusion and upon release from it as the true awakening to reality. Asceticism cannot be replaced by mortification or by the termination of life by suicide, for the latter is a physical method and would not terminate but continue the chain of physical causation. Only a spiritual remedy can effect the cure. Hence the need for the increasing spiritualization of life.

It is often argued that human nature cannot be suppressed or repressed and that its natural urges must be satisfied since artificial frustration or suppression of them may lead to pathological conditions. But for one convinced by metaphysics of the soul being separable from the body and able to exist in its natural condition when liberated from physical bondage, the argument would not be cogent. He would quite legitimately urge that a life in pursuit of physical desires involves violence to the deepest nature of man and therefore is itself pathological; the natural life of satisfaction of instincts is itself a state of malady and madness. Therefore any effort to cure this malady is really an effort to do justice to the real nature of man and to fulfil the basic aspiration of his being. So asceticism, far from involving suppression, offers redemption from a radical suppression and a road to sanity.

Can asceticism lead to enlightenment? In answer to this question three points must be considered. First, Lord Buddha tried asceticism and discovered it to be incapable of leading to enlightenment. He finally abandoned it and advocated the middle path. The *Gita* also supports "the middle way," which does not mean a judicious and prudent combination of self-gratification and self-denial. On the contrary, it means the total cessation of hankering for either bodily pleasures or bodily pains, the former object of hankering characterizing the hedonist and the latter, the pseudo-ascetics, whose practices of bodily mortification the Buddha abandoned. Hankering for either pains or pleasures means preoccupation with the body. The essence of the middle way is that one should pursue the path of righteousness, a positive direction of moral idealism, the eightfold path taught by the Buddha or Karma-Yoga as expounded by the *Gita*, not seeking to attain or avoid bodily pleasures or pains. It signifies equanimity or calm detachment, the centre of interest being the chosen path of Dharma. Neither the middle way of the Buddha nor that of the *Gita* abandons true Asceticism in the sense of transcendence of concern with consequences by way of pleasure or pain. Mere mortification of the flesh not necessitated by any positive ideal of righteousness is not true asceticism but inverted hedonism. Planning for bodily mortification only keeps alive and may increase

body-mindedness.

Asceticism alone, not forming part of a larger, comprehensive pathway to realization can never constitute an independent, self-sufficient road to enlightenment. Every ascetic code of morality like those of Jainism, Platonism, Stoicism, Kantianism, definitely formulates a systematic ladder of spiritual development in which Asceticism is an integral element. It must form part of a positive moral ideal of contemplation or of the religion of love or *Bhakti*.

But Asceticism is an utter necessity for spiritual illumination on any view of the Universe in which ultimate perfection consists in emancipation from material limitations and the resumption of the pure character of the soul. It is a necessary factor in spiritual progress. To take the *Gita* triad of the pathways to realization, which comprehends all the ways ever enunciated by human intelligence—*Karma*, *Jnana* and *Bhakti*—it is unthinkable that any of them could be followed without the spirit of renunciation. *Karma* implies detachment and disinterestedness in relation to results; *Jnana* implies uninterrupted inwardness of aspiration and absorption in the contemplation of the Absolute; *Bhakti* signifies the complete dedication of all desires, all actions, all thoughts to the single-minded, all-inclusive ideal of love of God. As Tulsidas puts it: "Rama cannot co-exist with Kama." As Rama comes to be enthroned in the soul of man, Kama must inevitably be annihilated. Thus, in all these courses, the evolution of the spirit necessitates Asceticism.

For one who does not accept the basic metaphysical idea of the soul and its destiny the logic of the position may not be conclusive; he needs a metaphysical discussion. But when the question is once settled in favour of a spiritual philosophy of reality, it becomes self-evident that asceticism is vitally necessary though not in itself sufficient for spiritual enlightenment, and for the ultimate attainment of perfection.

C. SETUBAI

HUMAN RIGHTS AND JAMAICA

It is reassuring to learn from *Unesco Features* for August 15th of the vigorous programme of the Jamaican Association for the United Nations, which has set up a Council of Human Rights to take appropriate action in cases of denial of human rights brought to its notice, and to set up a series of commissions to carry out research and collect information on various aspects of human rights in Jamaica.

These commissions, it is announced, are to "cover such fields as law, politics, racial questions, freedom of expression, social welfare and economic questions, including unemployment and trades union problems." It is planned to publish their reports, together with the text of the Declaration, in pamphlet form. This is excellent, and the example from the West Indies deserves to be widely followed.

DIOTIMA AND THE LOVER

[This article forms a chapter in a book to be published under the title "The Dialectics of Diotima," by a well-known woman writer. "**Diotima,**" the name of the woman at whose feet even the great Socrates sat, has been chosen by the author as her pseudonym. The book is to be anonymously published, we understand, so that its philosophical approach to the spiritual unification of mankind in general, and of East and West in particular, may be assessed on its own merits, independently of the author's other works. All the dialogues are thought-provoking, but this one has a definite message for our sense-ridden modern world.—ED.]

Lover : It is said, O Diotima, that, despite your avowed love of the Good, the True and the Beautiful, you live as a vestal virgin, without desire and without lovers, content with your philosophy. Now that seems to me to be a cold and sterile way of life and only possible to one who has not known the charm and ecstasies of love. Furthermore, I would say that one who has never known love has never really experienced the Good, the True and the Beautiful, however much they may theorize about such things.

Diotima : With your last words I am in total agreement, but your first denote misunderstanding, for it would be truer to say that " because of, " not " despite, " my love of the Good, the True and the Beautiful, I am able to live content. But that I am without desire is quite untrue, for no one who loves the Good can fail to desire a greater understanding of it. Finally, it is because I know so well the charms and ecstasies of love that contentment with such a way of life as mine is possible.

Lover : You have set a riddle greater than that of the Sphinx; for if you have indeed savoured the joys of love, how can you bear to live removed from your fellow-men and never know the joy of intimate intercourse with them ?

Diotima : So you believe we find that aspect of the Good, the True and the Beautiful known as Love through sexual intercourse ?

Lover : Certainly.

Diotima : And that when we have found it in such a way, we have made it ours forever ?

Lover : In a sense, for we now know what it is.

Diotima : Now this is interesting. You say that you have discovered the true nature of Love, and have, in a sense, made it yours forever, but that its joys cannot be experienced without the aid of another human being ?

Lover : Well, obviously.

Diotima : And is it always experienced through the same human being ?

Lover : No, not always.

Diotima : In your own case, for instance, have you loved one woman or many ?

Lover : Why, many ; since I am enough of a philosopher to know that it is not the woman I love but love itself, which is an integral part of the Good, the True and the Beautiful. Therefore what I love is what you think you love, but unless you have experienced it in union with a flesh-and-blood human being, you do not really know what love is.

Diotima : Will you not initiate me into this supreme mystery, which, according to you, I have missed through my absorption in philosophy ?

Lover : Indeed I will, for it is a mystic experience, as far above philosophy as the heavens are above the earth ; for instead of *speculating* on the Good, the True and the Beautiful, the lover becomes one with these things, enjoying celestial delights. For love is the greatest of life's joys. It is the supremely good, the supremely true, the supremely beautiful ; and after one has longed for these things all one's life, one suddenly finds them, in a single enchanted moment, in another human being. Yet that is not true. The being is not human, except to unenchanted eyes—she is Venus, Minerva and all the Graces in one, and she bestows on us immortality.

Diotima : How is that ?

Lover : It is part of the mystery. At one moment one is a man as other men, of no particular distinction or worth. In the next, one is a god, treading on air and able to conquer the world. And what has effected this miracle ?

Diotima : I wait, all impatience to hear.

Lover : One has fallen in love. One has beheld in another being all the beauty, the goodness, the intelligence, the loveliness for which the soul longed, and she or he beholds miraculously the same in us, and beholds it so steadfastly that we find ourselves becoming what the beloved imagines of us, so that even our appearance is transformed, and we *are* beautiful, we *are* good, we *are* strong, we are witty, we are courageous. We are all the good we see in our beloved, and she or he is all the good that he or she beholds in us. Is that not a miracle, Diotima, of all miracles ?

Diotima : It is indeed.

Lover : Ah ! I felt sure you must agree. And you will understand that when this thing happens there is a craving, a longing in each to be like each other in all things, to discover in each other mutual tastes and ideals, to become absolutely one with each other and never to separate. And this desire is so great that the two become lovers and, falling into each other's arms, achieve the supreme unity and are one indeed, with such delights in achieving this unity that you, Diotima, who have only known the transcendental love of ideas, cannot even conceive of. For one is then dead to the world as surely as any saint, and alive only to the delights of the beloved, and

the exquisite sensations which physical unity with the beloved brings. And in that exalted state of utter abandonment of the self to another's self, nothing matters; the greatest pain can be an exquisite pleasure; all sorrows recede; all problems are as nothing. One loves and is loved. The earth vanishes. Heaven remains.

Diotima: What you describe is indeed wonderful. And you say you have experienced it?

Lover: Indeed I have—many times, which is why I maintain that love is the Good itself, not a mere metaphysical abstraction, but that which may be achieved between flesh-and-blood men and women.

Diotima: And would you say, then, that you were in heaven now, at this moment?

Lover: Certainly not. I am discussing philosophy with you.

Diotima: But you told me that, in attaining to this supreme unity, earth vanished and heaven remained.

Lover: As indeed it does.

Diotima: But you say that you are not, now, in heaven. Did you, then, willingly leave it?

Lover: Of course not.

Diotima: Then how come you not to be in it still?

Lover: Why, I am not in the ecstasy that induces it.

Diotima: So your heaven is dependent on an ecstasy that must be induced by a relationship with another human being.

Lover: Well, yes.

Diotima: And therefore if you lived on a desert island or you were too old to achieve that physical unity of which you speak, you would be debarred from heaven?

Lover: At least I should have known it.

Diotima: Would that be any comfort when you were debarred from it forever?

Lover: But to have known heaven, if only for a moment, is surely better than never to have known it at all.

Diotima: Well, there I agree—if you *had* ever known it.

Lover: But I have proved to you that I have.

Diotima: You have done nothing of the sort. In fact, I will endeavour to prove to you that you do not know what heaven is.

Lover: In order to do that you would have to deny my experience, which is impossible.

Diotima: Tell me why, since you are not on a desert island, and are not old, you have temporarily abandoned heaven to come and talk to me.

Lover: Why, obviously because the ecstasy which induces that heaven cannot be evoked every hour of the day.

Diotima: Why is that?

Lover: Because one is human and therefore cannot exist at the highest emotional pitch for any length of time.

Diotima: You would say, I imagine, that emotion is intimately related to the human frame which can stand only a certain amount of emotional stress?

Lover: Yes, that is true.

Diotima: And therefore your heaven is dependent upon your body and its emotions?

Lover: To an extent, yes.

Diotima: And therefore without that body and those emotions you could not experience heaven?

Lover: Certainly.

Diotima: Then it seems to me that your heaven is based on curiously insecure foundations, and is most *un*like what all are agreed is essential to heaven, and that is the fact of its eternity.

Lover: But you are speaking only of the *idea* of heaven—the Cloud-Cuckoo Land of Yonder which men only theorize about. I talk of the heaven that can be known and experienced.

Diotima: But there are not two heavens, but *one*. And since only one can be true, which is it? Yours, which you describe as momentary, dependent upon another person and the body and emotions for its existence, or the heaven of Yonder, visualized by the ancients, which is eternal, dependent upon nothing but the spiritual foundations of the Good, the True and the Beautiful?

Lover: I will provide the test, Diotima, that will answer that—and the test is experience. I have experienced my heaven. You have only theorized about yours.

Diotima: If that is to be the sole test, then, my friend, you have already lost the day. For I am more assured than you yourself that Love is the Good and the Good is Love; and I have proved it by the same method by which you believe you have proved the actuality of your God—by my personal experience. For when I first perceived the true nature of the Good, the True and the Beautiful, I was, in that moment, reborn. For I loved it with all my heart, soul and mind. And, like you, it seemed that at one moment I was an ordinary woman and at the next the image and likeness of the glory that lay before me—the image of the all-Perfect, all-Beautiful, all-Wise, all-Joyful, all-True that I perceived as Reality. And I was filled with an indescribable and overwhelming longing for perpetual at-one-ment with this Reality; and I desired that no part of myself should remain except that which was indeed the image of that eternal perfection.

And by constant beholding and worshipping of that vision of beauty, which was the Good itself, I achieved an approximation to unity with that which I adored and craved; and in that unity there was perpetual bliss, for I knew that I and that which I adored were one forever, because that which I adored was eternal, and therefore, as I "at-oned" myself with it, I was one with eternity. And in this perfect unity, I lost all desire for that which was finite; and all lust for finite and temporal things was dissipated as into thin air. For having gained *all* there could be no desire for anything less. And so the unity became utter purification since it left no more to desire. And it remains the heaven of heavens since

it is perpetual bliss. And to this heaven I can resort at any moment of the day by the turning of my vision to what eternally IS instead of what temporarily *seems*. So that Yonder is more real to me than here; and heaven, which you say you may only glimpse, is to me perpetually present.

Lover: You speak, it is true, as though you had known in your mind much of the experience that I have actually had in the body; but the fact remains that I have really known heaven in my present state, whereas you have only keenly imagined it in your mind.

Diotima: Then would you say that the body alone experiences heaven?

Lover: Why, of course not; the mind must be there to enjoy the experiences of the body.

Diotima: So does it not follow that the mind experiences heaven and not the body? For you must admit that the body itself—without consciousness—could experience nothing of the kind.

Lover: Certainly.

Diotima: Then you would say that it is mind or consciousness which, in your case, experiences heaven through the body?

Lover: Yes.

Diotima: Then you must also admit that we have both experienced heaven through the same thing—mind and consciousness.

Lover: Yes, that is true.

Diotima: But that your mind and consciousness are dependent on the body and its emotions for the experience of heaven, and mine are not?

Lover: Yes, one could say that.

Diotima: So that if illness, old age or segregation from your fellow creatures occurred to you, you could not enter into your heaven?

Lover: That follows logically.

Diotima: But my heaven, not being dependent on these things, continues whether they happen to me or not. Nor does my at-one-ment with the Good, the True and the Beautiful lie in the imagination of another creature, but in my own living. And therefore would you not say that my heaven is more enduring, more secure, and therefore more true and more real than yours?

Lover: According to that line of reasoning, yes.

Diotima: And we said that there were not two heavens but one. Surely that one must be that which is enduring, true and real, and that which is unlike it must be fleeting, false and unreal?

Lover: That certainly follows in logic.

Diotima: Therefore I have done what you said could not be done—I have denied your experience of heaven; for I have proved it is not heaven at all, but only a false idea of heaven. Where are you going?

Lover: To my beloved—to enjoy on her lips the heaven that your reason would talk out of existence.

DIOTIMA

NEW BOOKS AND OLD

THE CLASSICAL MUSIC OF INDIA *

It was once suggested that every judge should be required to spend a week in gaol, incognito, before taking office. With a similar intent, every critical reader of a book on Indian music ought first to dwell for some time with the different Nāradas, Bharatas and Chaturas in our mythology.

The earliest records on Indian music belong to that glorious past where legends and history are woven into one, and the temporal, merging into the eternal, acquires the authority of antiquity. A chronological history of this ancient land is unknown; only unnamed sages "treating of undatable personages write history and criticism in one." It is, therefore, no mean task for M. Daniélou, who "traces the continuity of musical theory and practice in India for more than 2,000 years and gives a detailed description of the technique of Indian music as it exists today."

This book is about the music of Northern India as opposed to the Karnatic music of the South. Although the music of North India is better known as Hindustani music, the term "Hindustani" is here carefully avoided, presumably because it incorporates, by universal acceptance, the Muslim contributions to Hindu music, which contributions the author is at pains to deny. But his assertions are as unfounded as his reasoning is unsound. If we are to take out the undoubtedly Muslim elements, which the author calls "very minor points," from our present-day music of North India, *viz.*, the *Khèyal*, the *Tappā*, the *Gazal*, and the innumerable instrumental devices together with such instruments as the Sāranghi, the Sarode, etc., we should be left with the almost bare scales, which, though they might still provide sufficient materials for the scholars to build their theories upon, would most certainly starve the musician to death. In fact, the classical music of North India today represents a synthesis of Hindu and Islamic art which fact neither the scholar nor the politician could easily refute. Originating, as it does, from the simple folk, and developing in the aristocratic atmosphere of the Moghul Courts, Hindustani music has preserved the traditional spiritual aloofness in the confirmation of which both Vedanta and Sufism played their parts.

The first part of the book is devoted to the theory of music; the second, to technique as it is purported to exist today. The author's preoccupation with ancient theories—theories that are by no means easy to follow from the available Sanscrit texts—makes his just appreciation of the classical music of today unnecessarily difficult. But he exhibits great sympathy for our modal music, which is well brought out in the following passage:—

> So long as the hearer has not entirely identified himself with the tonic, but still perceives drone and melody as separate entities, it is impossible for him to follow or understand the meaning and the beauty of modal music.

---

* *Northern Indian Music.* Vol. I.—*Theory and Technique.* By ALAIN DANIELOU. (Christopher Johnson, London, and Visva Bharati, Calcutta. 163 pp. 1949. 25*s.* or Rs. 15/-)

Being conscious of the significance of microtonal nuances and the rhythmic subtleties of our music, the author naturally tries, as many Europeans have done before him, to put these down on paper by a system of elaborate notations which borrows freely from the Western staff notation and the Indian *Sol-fa*. This is skilfully done, though it betrays perhaps an obsession for excessive codification in the context of modern times.

Whatever may be the advantages of such clever notations to a Western musician studying the Indian *rāgas*, the practical musician in India is apt to open wide eyes of astonishment at the prospect of having to see in cold print the skeletal specimen of what is still throbbing in his heart. For him, there are no musical signs which he cannot hear; his scores are what he heard at the feet of his "Guru" and still carries in his memory; and he knows of no "composition" other than what comes from within. He recreates a *rāga* each time he touches his Viṇā, and knows it is not the *shrutis* (notes) themselves but the way he approaches them that makes or mars a *rāga*. This insistence, in our music, on the intervals rather than on the notes, is most difficult for the unaccustomed ear to grasp, but is of utmost importance in the expressions of *rāgas*.

The author's approach to the subject of the *rāga* is academic, and shows lack of contact with the living musicians who are the custodians of the oral tradition of this great art. He says:—

> The notes which are to convey certain definite emotions or ideas must be carefully selected from the 22 intervals of the *shruti* scale and then grouped to form a mode, a *raga*.

In practice, however, *rāgas* are more naturally formed out of existing folk melodies by gradual integration and crystallization than by *ad hoc* selection of notes from the scale. There are today a number of folk tunes, or "*dhun*," as the musicians call them, which are in the process of becoming *rāgas*, but are not actually such. In them, you could sing songs, or play "*gats*," but not the *ālāp*. Here it is well to remember Captain Willard's words of caution:—

> Books alone are insufficient for this purpose —we must endeavour to procure solutions from living professors, of whom there are several, although grossly illiterate.

The author gives a very interesting account of the expression of the *rāga*. The topic is, however, highly subjective; and his simple formula that, "The expression of a mode is the sum of the expressions of its different notes, defined by their relation with the tonic," will not be readily accepted.

The chapter on *tāla* (rhythm) is excellent; and its detailed analysis of a number of difficult *tālas* is sure to lead Western readers easily into the mysteries of the Eastern rhythm.

The bibliography is quite formidable and includes works in 10 different languages. In addition to published works, unpublished manuscripts are included—a valuable source of information. The attempted chronological grouping of the ancient authorities on music makes this volume useful to the research worker.

BHUPEN MUKERJEE

The Co-operative Movement in India: Its Relation to a Sound National Economy. By ELEANOR M. HOUGH, M.A., PH.D. Second Revised and Enlarged Edition (for India and Pakistan). (Geoffrey Cumberlege, Oxford University Press, Indian Branch. 422 pp. 1950. Rs. 15/- or 25*s*.)

"If co-operation fails there will fail the best hope of rural India." In these words the Royal Commission on Agriculture in India described in 1928 the importance of the Co-operative Movement to this country. Many books on the Co-operative Movement in India have been written since then—a notable contribution being this book which was first published in 1932, the present volume being a revised and enlarged edition. The Co-operative Movement has made considerable progress in India during the last 2 decades and that has made all books written about 1930 out of date. All students of Co-operation should, therefore, be very grateful to the author for bringing out this 2nd edition with the contents brought up to date. A noteworthy feature of the book, apart from many others, is the elaborate documentation, with practically every statement in its 342 pages of text supported by some official report or standard publication.

The late Sir Horace Plunkett, who wrote an introduction to the 1st edition, paid a well-deserved compliment to the industry of the author :—

> The interested student will ...observe also how, in the Appendices, many books of reference and innumerable official documents are listed—not, as is a too common practice, in order to impress the reader with the comprehensiveness of the documentation, but to enable him to find the relevant needles in the huge stacks of hay. Close upon a thousand notes give the authorities upon which she relies for statements made.

The author, who has resided in India since 1933, is not actively associated with the Co-operative Movement. On going through the book one wonders if that is not rather an advantage inasmuch as she has been able to see the wood which one often fails to see in looking at the trees.

The book is a mine of information and hardly any type of Co-operative Society or any trend in Co-operative thought has been omitted. Her evaluation of the Co-operative Movement is scientific and detached. She warms up only on one issue, *viz.*, the trend which she sees in the Movement away from the Co-operative ideal and towards compulsion. She does not mind the trend towards officialism, the "controlled credit" scheme, "which, in the interest of the group, waives a part of the opportunity for character training which ideally Co-operation offers to the individual." But she does object to the trend towards compulsion which has been growing in favour in the last few years and which holds a threat not only to all beyond the strictly material ends of Co-operation but even to democracy itself.

She asks herself the question which suggests itself to many of us. So many years have passed since the Indian Co-operative Movement was launched. What has it achieved and how far has it justified the high hopes of the early sponsors? And she gives the reply which would find favour with most of us :—

> Incommensurate as the progress of the Indian Co-operative Movement has been with the hopes with which it was launched, it is impossible to concede that the effort has not

been worth the money and effort which have gone into it.

The author has an abiding faith in the Co-operative Movement. It is not the faith of an uninformed enthusiast but of a scholar deeply versed in co-operative lore and she concludes her excellent book with the following observation :—

> If, in the light of the history of the Co-operative Movement in India one's attitude towards it can be only what the Madras Committee on Co-operation aptly called " a chastened optimism " yet the evidence is conclusive that its furtherance merits the support of every friend of the people of the Indian subcontinent. "

JANARDAN A. MADAN

Shakespeare and the Romance Tradition. By E. C. PETTET. (Staples Press Ltd., London. 208 pp. 1949. 12*s.* 6*d.*)

This book will interest the students of Shakespeare at the post-graduate stage, but not those who, without any pretensions to scholarship, want to heighten their appreciation of Shakespeare. Throughout the book the tone of the writer is scholarly, extremely critical and polemical. It is, in fact, the tone of a person who is writing a Ph. D. thesis and not essaying a work of literary appreciation or criticism. Still it will be found useful for those who are specializing in the study of Shakespeare, for it seeks to trace the historical origins of his comedies and romances, thereby linking up the works of such poets and dramatists as Chaucer, Spenser, Philip Sidney, Lyly and Greene with Shakespeare. But the historic origins of a movement are not everything. Moreover, it seems not right to think that a man of genius like Shakespeare could be so extremely sensitive to the traditions and pattern of a European literary movement. He was not impervious to what was in the air but he imbibed it unconsciously and not analytically. In this context a remark like this—" For in reality Shakespeare's comedies are ' romantic ' in the historical and most precise sense of the word. They are the climax, historically and æsthetically, of the assimilation of the romantic heritage into English drama "—becomes special pleading. In fact, the more one reads Shakespeare, the more one comes to the conclusion of how partial are the attempts of those, like Dowden and others, who wanted to fit his plays into neat and precise categories or who tried to see in Shakespeare the flowering of this tradition or that or the culmination of one trend or another.

Mr. Pettet writes about the homogeneous groups of ' romantic ' comedies, ' dark ' comedies and ' romances ' and thinks plays like *The Comedy of Errors* to be oddities. True criticism consists in differentiation and one would welcome the kind of Shakespearian critic who would look upon each play as an oddity, that is to say, as something unique. It may be good class-room criticism to lump together the various plays of Shakespeare in one category or another, but it is hardly just to him. All the same, this book will be found to be very helpful to those who want to understand the origins, historical and otherwise, of Shakespeare's comedies.

DIWAN CHAND SHARMA

Wordsworth: An Introduction and a Selection. By NORMAN NICHOLSON. (Phœnix House, London. 238 pp. 1949. 8*s.* 6*d.*)

The key to this selection of Wordsworth's poems, made by one who is himself a poet and a critic of quality, is the interesting analogy drawn between the 3 modes of Wordsworth's poetry and the 3 types of rock found in Cumberland scenery. Not that the poetry is claimed to be a direct product of the rock environment, since the poet's formative years were spent elsewhere, but Mr. Nicholson makes the comparison a stimulation to better comprehension.

> Skiddaw slate represents the basic Wordsworth, the plain, bold, solid verse of the experiments and of *Resolution and Independence*; the volcanic rock represents the soaring poetry of Tintern Abbey; and the Silurian rock represents the long anticlimax of the later years. They appear in the same order as the rocks, but they overlap and are doubled upon each other, not only poem by poem, but even within the same poem.

Wordsworth, like all writers of note, needs to be viewed from fresh angles again and again, if he is not to be left aside as a name and a reputation. His work, too, more than that of many others, needs judicious sifting; and the average reader, discouraged by the mass of "Silurian mud" can be grateful to have the approach to the heights of Wordsworth's achievement made clearer. The selection of 83 items includes Tales in Verse, Narrative Poems, Ballads, Songs and Sonnets, Poems on Romantic Themes, Extracts from "The Prelude" and Poems of Description and Reflection.

E. W.

The Pilgrimage of Perseverance. By ETHEL M. WOOD. (The National Council of Social Service, Inc., London. 90 pp. 1949. 6*s.*)

This is an interesting and well documented short history of women's expulsion from and return to citizenship in England, from Saxon times to the present. The author explains that such a brief survey could not possibly touch on every aspect of the Women's Movement, even in one country; and that she has dealt chiefly with the urban social and industrial conditions because she holds that "the evils that robbed and degraded women" were greatly augmented by the artificiality and the unnatural problems of city life.

She does not, however, place the blame for the present tragic and critical world situation, and women's place and part in it, wholly on outside conditions. After tracing the valiant fight of women against many kinds of brutality, immorality and injustice, she concludes her book:—

> The appalling dangers that confront humanity "half crushed by its own progress and its mechanisms" can only be met by moral revitalization.

She points out that through their own courageous efforts women have now a noble opportunity to work with men for the peace and betterment of the whole world and that their doing so "has become a stark necessity." She gives inspiring glimpses of the sacrifices and achievements of some of the great pioneer women, whose examples clearly indicate the path along which the "pilgrimage of perseverance" should continue.

An excellent Bibliography is appended.

E. P. T.

The New Man: An Interpretation of Some Parables and Miracles of Christ. By MAURICE NICOLL. (Stuart and Richards, London. 153 pp. 1950. 15s.)

This is an interesting attempt to interpret psychologically some of the parables, miracles and teachings of Jesus. The underlying idea, that there is a need to understand scriptural teachings at a spiritual level and not take them literally at a material level, is fully acceptable. Jesus himself indicated how an extension of the scriptures might be made when he taught: "It hath been said by them of old time... but I say unto you...." Also he extended adultery to a carnal wish; he equated murder with a feeling of anger and unkindliness. Thus far we may safely go. But when Dr. Nicoll includes in adultery the "mixing of different doctrines and different teachings," and includes in stealing the feeling of conceit aroused by exerting one's own power, it seems he is pressing his psychological interpretation too far. Imperialism may be regarded as a form of stealing, but beyond that are deep waters.

Here is an example of far-fetched interpretation of a simple teaching of Jesus: "And whosoever shall give to drink unto one of these little ones a cup of cold water only in the name of a disciple, verily I say unto you, he shall in no wise lose his reward." Dr. Nicoll renders it as follows:—

> Here a literal-minded person will think that all that is necessary is to give a cup of cold water to a child. But if water means Truth, then the phrase refers to the handing on of Truth, however poorly....Let us also notice that, to receive Truth, the mind must be like a cup, which receives what is poured into it. That is, a man must be ready and willing to be taught, so that his mind is like a cup, to receive water. So the phrase "giving a cup of water" refers both to receiving Truth and handing it on to others.

Dealing with the parable of the "mustard seed, which a man took, and sowed in his field" and the parable of the "leaven, which a woman took, and hid in 3 measures of meal, till the whole was leavened," Dr. Nicoll comments as follows:—

> Notice first of all about these two brief parables that the idea of *taking* appears in both. Taking what? Taking hold of the teaching sown on man....To *take* is the first thing that is necessary. The man *takes* the seed—that is, he must take hold himself of the teaching of the Kingdom...to *take* implies that he puts forth his hand in order to *take*, and *hand* in the ancient language of parables is power, because, in a physical or literal sense, through his hand a man is able to take what he wishes. To *take*, then, means that the man thinks and chooses for himself and so *from himself* takes hold of the teaching of the Kingdom of Heaven.

All this indicates too much learning and much sophistication without any purpose. The simple teachings, the meanings of which are crystal clear, are tortured beyond recognition. We grant that there can be, and it is intended that there should be, psychological interpretation of parables, and to some extent of miracles, but that does not warrant sermons like those of Dr. Nicoll. We may say that his interpretation itself forms an interesting study in psychology.

J. C. KUMARAPPA

The Hippolytus of Euripides. A translation by REX WARNER. (The Bodley Head, London. 72 pp. 1949. 7*s.* 6*d.*); *The Birds.* By ARISTOPHANES; translated into English verse with Introduction and Notes by GILBERT MURRAY. (Geo. Allen and Unwin, Ltd., London. 183 pp. 1950. 7*s.* 6*d.*)

Chance brings us at the same time fresh translations of two masterpieces of the Greek drama, the *Hippolytus* of Euripides and *The Birds* of Aristophanes, which alike focus attention on the attitude of the Athenians towards their gods.

Of course, each of these works can be regarded from a number of different angles. The *Hippolytus* is a triumph of dramatic tension, psychology, ironic humour and lyrical beauty—one of the greatest plays that has ever been written. In *The Birds* Aristophanes shows himself as always jester, politician, enchanting song-writer, master of fantasy and stage spectacle. But here it happens that, with an almost Shelleyan impiety, he deposes the gods (in whose very temple his play was being performed) and proposes the birds of the air as better rulers of the world and heavens; while Euripides, in more sombre vein, shows us an Aphrodite filled with the spirit of murderous jealousy and a virginal Artemis too dainty to let her eyes be affronted by the spectacle of her devout worshipper's death. And it was this Aristophanes who in the *Frogs* savagely satirized this Euripides as the destroyer of the ancient ways!

Explanations have been offered of this astonishing paradox. Dr. Gilbert Murray in his Introduction finds it odd that "at a time of so much religious excitement in Athens" *The Birds* "did not lead to a prosecution for impiety." He suggests that the Olympian deities ridiculed by Aristophanes had not the sanctity of "the true objects of local worship" in Athens, like the pillars of the Hermæ or the native Korê. Mr. Warner, similarly dealing with the unworthy portraits of the divinities in the *Hippolytus*, has it that these goddesses "are used as symbols to define and circumscribe a human problem." (We recall that that excellent critic A. B. Walkley a good many years ago described them as "in fact, forces of nature"). But it remains curious that the pagen deities, which are by the modern Western world, if not believed in, at least regarded as ideal figures of poetic and ethical beauty, should be so often by their own professing worshippers in antiquity painted as dark, despicable and malignant.

Surely in this attitude of the poets there is an implicit recognition of the truth plainly expressed by the philosophers of Greece that, behind these all-too-human denizens of Olympus, this gluttonous Heracles, this crafty, political Poseidon, this spitefully feminine Aphrodite—let them be taken for real persons or personifications of natural powers or symbols of psychic forces—there must lie a grander, an unlimited, an all-embracing Reality, the ground of the universe, of which they themselves are but the shadows and the puppets. For the Theosophist the particular gods of all faiths are but partial and perishable manifestations of this Absolute One, and he is able to illuminate his reading of the Greek drama with this reconciling philosophy.

Meanwhile readers of these excellent translations who are not overmuch con-

cerned with metaphysical speculations will find preserved in them all that translation can preserve of the magnificent originals. In a post-war world they will find plenty to amuse them in the Commissar, the Law Monger with his controls and regulations, the town-planner Meton, and other figures drawn from the experiences of war-time Athens when *The Birds* was produced. Dr. Gilbert Murray's verse has its familiar swing and rhythm, and its familiar skill in bringing in sly modern allusions. Mr. Warner's more modern style is austerer and, some may think, a trifle prosaic here and there, but it is compact and admirably suited to the more ironic passages of the tragedy, such as the prattle of Phaedra's old nurse with her homely worldliness.

D. L. MURRAY

Edicts of Aśoka (*Priyadarśin*). Translated into English by G. SRINIVASA MURTI and A. N. KRISHNA AIYANGAR. (The Adyar Library, Madras. 147 pp. 1950. Boards, Rs. 2/-; cloth, Rs. 3/-)

The edicts of Aśoka, engraved on rock, pillar and cave, and presented here in their original *Prākṛt* (the Maghdhan vernacular, the common spoken language of the people at that time) might as well be called "the ethics of Aśoka." For their motive, as is given in Rock Edict No. 4, is "to promote the practice of *Dharma*," as against the usual motive of such edicts; namely, the praise of a king or the "publication" of his proclamations, embodying some order of the State. This book gives them with their Sanskrit text, transliteration in Roman script and translation into English.

The ethics of Aśoka, however, are universal in their appeal and ambit, because they are concerned more with canons of good conduct, based on altruistic action (*dharmamangale*), culminating in the Rule of Righteousness (*dharma-vijaya*), than with either Buddhism or Brahminism or any other "ism" as such. These canons are derived from the Emperor's love for humanity ("*All* men are my children" —Kalinga Edict II) and his life's ideal expressed in the words: "Concord alone is excellent" (*Samavāya eva Sādhuḥ*).

All the edicts presented in the volume do not deal only with the ethics of the individual. There are a few which relate also to the administrative system of Aśoka. For example, the commendation of pilgrimages (*tīrtha-yātrā*) instead of the old pleasure tours (*vihāra-yātrā*); the planting of trees and groves, especially of fruit-trees; the erection of rest-houses and water-sheds for wayfarers, etc.

Professor K. V. Rangaswami Aiyangar has contributed a most valuable Introduction, which serves as a stimulating background to the study of the edicts.

The *Edicts of Aśoka*, if studied and practised in the offices of those wielding authority and in the homes of all earnest lovers of life, would go a long way toward arresting the prevailing moral confusion, corruption and chaos.

G. M.

Classical Indian Sculpture: 300 B. C. to 500 A. D. By CHINTAMONI KAR. (Alec Tiranti, Ltd., London. 38 pp. 86 plates. 1950. 6s.)

The author has delightfully annotated his 86 reproductions of sculpture. To muse over these pictures is to be drawn back into touch with the life, imagination and temperament of men far away from us in time. As we should expect, Buddhism is a wide-spread influence and there are quite obvious effects due to Alexander's campaign; but, as Mr. Kar says, the temperament of India was much too definite for her artists to adopt from the Greeks more than something of their brilliant technique.

Indian sculptors delighted in using the whole of the surface upon which they were working and if their carvings look complex and overcrowded, they also have great richness and vitality. Those artists excelled in patterns of birds, flowers or elephants. Their female figures show, as usual in early art, exaggerated breasts and buttocks.

Here is an entrancing record of antique art in a country which could never for long get away from symbolism and the spiritual world.

CLIFFORD BAX

Some Aspects of Education in Ancient India. By DR. C. KUNHAN RAJA. (Adyar Library Series No. 73, The Adyar Library, Adyar, Madras. 111 pp. 1950. Rs. 2/8).

In view of the avowed objective of the University Commission appointed by the Government of India, and headed by Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, *viz.*, "to make our education more Indian in character than it has been," this publication is timely. It consists of 2 Dewan Bahadur K. Krishnaswami Rao Endowment Lectures, delivered under the auspices of the University of Madras last November. The central texts on which Dr. Raja dwells over and over again are: "One should study what has been prescribed for his own study" and "Then, therefore, the desire to know *Dharma* and *Brahman.*" With the aid of allusion to and description of certain religious ceremonies like *upanayana* (initiation) and *upasadana* (the voluntary approach of a disciple to a teacher for higher knowledge), he comes to the conclusion that the system of education in ancient India was such as made education obligatory and universal, the spirit and sanction behind this "compulsion" being "the sense of civic duty." This obligatory education, however, occupied only the 2nd stage in the system, as the 1st stage was pursued at home before the initiation; while in the 3rd, voluntary, stage, specialization or advanced study in some subjects was usually the student's aim. Perhaps the treatment of the theme, which is so vital and so vast, could not be covered adequately in a couple of lectures. As it is, Dr. Raja has only thrown out suggestions or inferences, and has not worked these out fully. It is to be hoped, therefore, that he will before long write a full-length work on the subject.

G. M.

The Thinker's Handbook: A Guide to Religious Controversy. By HECTOR HAWTON. (Watts and Co., London. 248 pp. 1950. 2*s.* 6*d.*)

This book has the usefulness of a small, compact museum. It summarizes simply the historical arguments on the perennial religious and philosophic problems—reason and revelation, the authority of tradition, good and evil, free-will and determinism, the natural universe and the supernatural existence of God. It considers the origin of religion, various anthropological and theological interpretations, and the effect on society of Church and of Rationalism. The author, a Rationalist, endeavours to hold a fair balance. While repudiating blind faith, he recognizes the higher flights of the creative imagination, yet concludes that, since these surpass the limits of language, they must be left out of any rational system of knowledge. This implies that there is only one method of using language, and only one valid system of communicable knowledge. Yet language has a descriptive and also an evocative function. The first gives reason its data. The second awakens a correspondence of understanding in the recipient ("intuition," if one is not afraid of the word). It is a pity to shut the inquirer within the museum halls of reason, useful as they are, simply because communication of the living nature "outside" depends on another mode of speech, a "new" style of thinking.

E. W.

Out of My Later Years. By ALBERT EINSTEIN. (Philosophical Library, New York. 282 pp. 1950. $4.75)

This collection of essays hitherto unpublished, which flowed from the great scientist's pen from 1934 to 1950, is a sequel to *The World As I See It*, a collection of similar material from 1922 to 1934.

The six sections of the present volume are headed: "Convictions and Beliefs"; "Science"; "Public Affairs"; "Science and Life"; "Personalities" and "My People." They reveal the author's many-faceted personality. The one over-all impression left on the reviewer's mind, however, is that the discoverer of the Theory of Relativity—to an explanation of which in a general way the section on "Science" is devoted—stresses repeatedly and rightly the vision and value of "the ethical good" *of the whole of humanity*. This he does in his approach to life and in his solutions of some of the most urgent and outstanding problems which confront the world today.

In his opinion, the *co-operation of Science and Religion* would facilitate considerably the untying of the knots. "Science without religion is lame; religion without science is blind." He believes that a man truly filled with the ideal of "the ethical good" will *not* be content to

> receive from his fellow-men a much greater return in goods and services than most other men ever receive; or to see his country, because it feels itself for the time being militarily secure, stand aloof from the aspiration to create a supra-national system of security and justice.

Therefore it is by this standard that he judges in his essays and utterances such crucial issues as Socialism, the Negro Question, World Government, Education, Military Service, Zionism and allied matters. A stimulating book, indeed.

G. M.

The English Mystics. By GERALD BULLETT. (Michael Joseph, Ltd., London. 239 pp. 1950. 12*s.* 6*d.*)

Mr. Gerald Bullett is well qualified to write on the English mystics. He knows his subject and writes with a modesty that commands immediate respect. Biography fuses with criticism, quotation mingles with comment; arid controversy is avoided; and the exposition is lucid and instructive. Mr. Bullett rightly describes mysticism as a psychological event; a spiritual sensation; "a sense or apprehension of an immortal reality in and beyond appearances, and, no less, in and beyond oneself." The mystic, by an act of self-transcendence, leaps over the bars that seem to separate Appearance from Reality, the Many from the One, Time from Eternity; and he experiences the Real, the One, the Eternal. In a word, the mystic sounds "deeper than ever plummet sounded," and touches the base, the all-sustaining ground:—

> ...the one interior life
> In which all beings live with God, themselves
> Are God, existing in the mighty whole.

While all mystical experience is quintessentially the same—the generation of vast circles of peace and harmony and love—the description of the experience varies, being inevitably coloured by local and personal bias. One mystic resorts to poetry, another to exhortation, a third to philosophical speculation. Besides, not even a mystic can escape, in his everyday life, the limitations of his temperament. Juliana's ecstasies are childlike in their simplicity and overpowering charm, while Blake's visions are recorded with "exuberances, extravagances and obscurities of expression." Nevertheless, the very diversity of the mystics gives peculiar weight to the truths to which they witness with such radiant force and unanimity.

Mr. Bullett surveys the English mystics roughly in their chronological order: Richard Rolle, Juliana and the anonymous author of *The Cloud of Unknowing;* George Fox, "the unlettered God-possessed mystic"; the "metaphysical" poets of the 17th century; Whichcote and the Cambridge Platonists; William Law, to whom the spirit of Love was the truth and reality of God in the soul; Blake, the half-mad ecstatic and inspired poet; and Wordsworth, whose mysticism was as pronounced as his humanism. The survey is impressive, being both well-informed and objective, and the biographical details are never excrescent and never dull.

In the final chapter, Mr. Bullett liberally draws upon Sri Aurobindo's *The Life Divine*, and accepts his view of omnipresent reality. Mysticism confuses, as it were, the categories of spirit and matter, and sees them in their splendorous unity as *Sat-chit-ananda;* and mysticism is of ambrosial value for us because it means an awakening of the soul, a release of the spirit and a life of charity, humility, peace and love. The book is well illustrated, and most attractively produced.

K. R. SRINIVASA IYENGAR

THE INDIAN INSTITUTE OF CULTURE

[The Indian Institute of Culture, Basavangudi, Bangalore, which celebrated its 5th Anniversary with a Special Meeting on August 12th, held 3 other Special Meetings in August, celebrating, respectively, World Peace Day, Tagore Day and Independence Day. Between mid-May and September 1st there were 5 Discussion Meetings (one of them a " Special Unesco Meeting " on " Food and People ") at which papers by distinguished absent writers were read and considered. There were, besides, 5 meetings of the Book Discussion Group, 2 musical recitals, and 4 lectures in Kannada.

English lectures during the period included two on Buddhism by Dr. Felix Valyi ; " The Upbringing of an African Child " by Mr. Godwin Lewanika ; the Wordsworth Centenary Lecture by Prof. P. K. Venkata Rao, the Bach Bicentenary Lecture by Dr. W. Graefe and other interesting lectures on subjects as varied as " The Gita Way of Living, " " Poetry and Truth," " Racialism in South Africa," " The Contribution of Kashmir to Sanskrit Literature," " Children Without Fear," " Public Life," " Comparison of Modern and Classical Theories of Empiricism in Europe " and " The Evolution of Indian Culture."

A very interesting meeting was held on the 5th of August under the chairmanship of Mr. B. P. Wadia. The speakers were all American educationists who were attending the International Students' Seminar at Mysore. Dr. Paul Weaver, Dean of Stephens College, Columbia, Missouri, the Director of the Seminar, gave a lecture on " Human Relations Across National Frontiers," which we hope to print in our next issue.

" The Rôle of the University in Social Development " was the subject for a symposium by four speakers ; two were unavoidably detained and came late and were able to give to the enthusiastic and crowded meeting only a greeting. Below we publish the report of the speeches and the greetings.—Ed.]

THE ROLE OF THE UNIVERSITY IN SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

A SYMPOSIUM

Dr. Paul Anderson (*President, Pennsylvania College for Women, Pittsburgh*) :

I think I speak for all of the American Delegation in saying how happy we are to be with you, because we have something in common in our cultural heritage. We had in fact a longer colonial rule in our history than you ; we have had a longer period of independence than you ; but we have both had both and there is no doubt that in the years to come India and the United States will merge together as two of the great nations of the world.

But, despite all this, the world is today what we would not wish it to be. Whether you look at home affairs or international affairs, from the standpoint of economics, of sociology, or of politics, things are not as they ought to be. Therefore the question is, what is the matter ? Some believe that we must change our economic system and all will be well. There are others who would say that all you have to do is to get a new political régime ; kick out the old régime and put in a new one and somehow, as if by magic, the change will work for human good. And there are others who say it is a philo-

sophical or religious or other change that is needed. But certainly one fact ought to stand out among those who are involved in the process of education, namely, that the first and foremost reason why we have problems in the world is because we do not have as many good people as we ought to have. And before we try to find out solutions in divers economic or political forms let us first search our own hearts and find out if there are not changes that can be worked in our educational structure, in the lower systems of education as well as in the University, which may produce a new and finer generation of people who can propose something better for the solution of the broad human problems with which we are faced today.

The university cannot wash its hands and say it is not responsible for the situation that exists in the world today. But I would suggest two things. The first is that in this century there has been an increasing exclusiveness in the university community. This has involved the isolation of scholarship. We have studied, as professors and research people, things in which we happen to be interested as individuals without regard to their social productivity. We have almost set up a social aristocracy. I am not speaking only of my own country, I am speaking of all the countries in the world. We have a tremendous tendency in education to isolate ourselves from the social world in which we live. And the result is more and more concentration on smaller and smaller issues. You sometimes wonder, in talking with educated people on the campuses of the Universities of the world and hearing the idle patter about issues with which they are concerned, "How can the world be saved with people like this ?"

There is a second thing wrong with the University besides its increasing tendency to be isolated, intellectually and socially, from the community, from society. There has been a tendency to train our generation not only in habits of mind but with relatively limited specialization. However well we may train specialists in different fields, we are failing to train leaders of the world with moral sense, with social impulses and with the conscientiousness for the future of the world that will alone permit us to change institutions for the better in the long run.

In our country we have had a great tendency to move away from the tremendous amount of specialization which has existed in our institutions of higher learning. But I find we are not alone in having specialization, it is common to universities almost the world over, certainly in the Western world; and as I learn now of your system of education, I feel that you are narrowing in terms of specialization perhaps to a greater extent than the U.S.A.

I remember a talk 10 years ago with a good friend of mine who had escaped from Germany before it was too late; I was asking him what his feeling was about the kind of education that had been common in Germany. He said that the only reason why Hitler had been able to conquer the Germans was. that the educated people were too negligent about the problems of society and too much concerned about their own small fields of specialization.

In our country I learnt from one of the great paper manufacturers that he was starting a system of education to

train advanced workers.

I asked, " What do you mean ? "

His reply was that a great many Ph.D's in chemistry and physics were working for them and nothing would please him more than to put them in positions of responsibility, but they were failures in all business fields and would never suit in any place of responsibility. " So, " he said, " we are introducing in our curriculum courses in history, in literature, in the humanities, so that our Ph.D's can learn how to fill positions of responsibility. "

So, I am not far wrong, I think, if I say that our country and yours will profit from training in social issues, in moral sense on the part of the individual, and in good human and economic relations, without which neither this world nor any other can develop better. It is our responsibility in the universities to get into the world rather than out of it and to provide students with broader training so that they too can make their real contribution to the world of the future which we hope will be one.

DR. WILLIAM STUART NELSON (*Dean of Howard University, Washington, D.C.*):

I have been thinking a great deal of late about the future of our world, and how intimately you, I and all of us are bound up together in that future. A few months ago in the United States one of our great officials whom we call Mayors, not only an official, but also a man of great wit and heart, sent some one a telegram saying : " Take the next plane to New York. "

He wired him back : " Mayor, I shall take the next train to New York."

When in New York, the Mayor said to him, " I asked you to come by plane ; why did you not do so ? "

He asked : " Do you think I would risk my life ? "

The Mayor said, " You will not die until your time comes. "

He thought for a moment and said, " No, but it may be the pilot's time. "

Whatever happens to one of us in the future is very likely to happen to all of us, and so we ought to be concerned about the future. Now, what kind of a future do we want ? I want to suggest that our future ought to be first, free from domination, second, free from contempt, and third, free from want. One of the miracles of the past few years has been the fact that the world has become increasingly free from political domination. As we look today at Asia, we see that Asia almost miraculously has become independent —India, Burma, Ceylon, Indonesia— that is a wonderful thing.

Now, what we need is that all the world shall be free from domination. I work in a university in which there are many students from Africa and sometimes an official from the United Nations comes to speak to our students, to tell them what the United Nations is going to do for us. Once one of the students asked : " What voice have we in what you are going to do for us ? " These Africans are men with physical needs, but when these physical needs are to be met, they want to have a say as to how they shall be met. They want to be free from domination in their desire and expressing that desire. Actually you find when you read the papers that in Nigeria they are expressing that desire to be free in terms that are not so good. If we want the kind of world

in which we'd like to live, we should urge upon those who dominate politically others over whom they hold power, that at least we want a world free from economic domination. Economic domination is a dangerous thing, sometimes more dangerous than political domination, because it is more subtle. It does not ride in with armies or flags; it can ride in on the pound sterling or the dollar or, in other countries, on the rupee. It is a subtle thing, but very dangerous. So the world ought to be free from it. Then it ought to be free from social domination, from the class differences which mean that one class becomes strong and another weak and that the stronger class dominates the weaker. We want a world that is free from such domination.

Also, our future world ought to be a world that is free from contempt. There are those who say that Asia has wanted to be free, not simply because she had physical needs of bread, clothing and shelter, but also because she wanted to be free from contempt; she wanted to be free from every institution, from every sign in any place which suggested that the people of Asia were not as good as the people of the West. What they wanted was freedom from contempt between races of mankind. Why should one race have contempt for another? Given a little more comfort and more opportunities, surely one race can become just like the other. A few centuries and all of us get changed. Why should any of us have contempt for the members of another race?

Freedom from contempt as between religions. My field of study has been that of religion. I have read the scriptures of all the great religions. I have learnt to read them with care and the more I have read them, the deeper I have gone into them, down deep beneath all superficialities I find one common thing. I can quote from all the great religions of the world and all the prophets of the world have said: "Love each other." Deep down in all the religions, different as they are, you will find that each man shall love and serve his fellow-men. Then if, in the course of time, you have come to worship God in this way or that and I in another way, why should I have contempt for you? Man can worship God in a church or in a temple or in a mosque, whichever he likes. You have your way and your house of God and I have mine. As Gandhiji has said, all these ways lead to God. Then, why should one have contempt for the religion of the other?

Well, now I come from contempt of classes and religions to those who have different work in life. I often look at the people doing humble work, cooks, washermen, etc. Why should I, a professor, have contempt for them? When I went to college, although my father was a doctor, I earned all the money I needed by shining the shoes of other men, blacking their boots, doing as dirty work as a man can do. Then why should I have contempt for those who sweep my room or who take care of my little needs? We have made a resolution in our house, my wife and I, that we will always do some of the menial tasks. Every day something, either scrubbing the floor of the bathroom and washing it, or some other menial job, so that we shall never feel contempt for those who do the lowly tasks of life. This world of the future, in which we are to survive or

be condemned together, must be a world in which one man never has contempt for another.

Now there is a final freedom and that is the freedom from want. I mean the physical wants, the needs of all men for at least a minimum of food, clothing and shelter. I often say to the people in the United States, we have more than the rest of the world; one-half of the world is hungry today; one-half of the human race is undernourished. During the recent war, I learnt that 16,000,000 Chinese were refugees; so I called up the Chinese Embassy to enquire how much money it would take to take care of these refugees for a year. I found out that $4.00 (Rs. 20/-) from every adult in the United States would have provided these 16,000,000 Chinese people with everyday food, clothing and shelter for one year. How easily we could have given that. It is cigarette money, not even that. I found at the same time, that if we had spent $1.00 each on building schools in Africa, we could have built one school, furnished it and supplied it with a teacher for one year, for every village in the whole continent of Africa.

We must see to the needs of those who have not the bare necessities and see that they are free from want. If we do not see that, we are going to see something much worse. There is a book in which the writer describes the conditions obtaining during a period of disillusionment when men turned cannibals. If men are not freed from their wants, they will break the heads of other men. It may not be too far away, for those who have suffered want for so long are becoming aroused from their slumber; they are becoming conscious and it is for us who have full stomachs and good clothing and shelter to resolve that we will do our part to see that the world is free from want. This is the kind of world we want, therefore, in which we shall live and not only die together. A world that is free from domination, free from contempt and free from want.

DR. RUTH C. WRIGHT (*Dean of Students, College of the City of New York*):

I came here last year and had a most delightful time in your midst. I am grateful for the opportunity of coming again. I was delayed. May I leave the word which came to me as a result of Mr. Wadia's message? It is something which Paul Hoffman, who has been administering the programme for the United Nations, said in talking to our students: "Make no small plans, because only great plans have the power to kindle the imagination of man." May I wish for you great plans here at the Indian Institute of Culture?

DR. SHERMAN SCRUGGS (*President of Lincoln University, Jefferson City, Missouri*):

You inspire me and I wish I could take away what you are seeing in your vision to improve the great programme that I am engaged in in America. I wish there were time to talk to you about all that. But I am deeply grateful to be here.

Mr. B. P. Wadia thanked the speakers and referred to the hope and the vision which he and his colleagues had for the Indian Institute of Culture.

ENDS AND SAYINGS

" _____ *ends of verse*
And sayings of philosophers. "
HUDIBRAS

A constructive proposal for "intellectual nation building" was made by the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Poona, the Rt. Hon. Dr. M. R. Jayakar, in his Convocation Address on August 28th. We should like to see the "Faculty of Indian Culture" which he recommended set up in every university of India. Certainly the Indian universities are falling short of their opportunities to contribute to national unity if they fail to acquaint their graduates with the history and intellectual achievements of races, communities and provinces other then their own. Dr. Jayakar recalled that history records not a few instances of nations being built out of elements uniting in a common endeavour to understand, appreciate and revere the culture and civilization of the component sections. That furnishes the adhesive elements which ultimately clasp them together in bonds of steel.

Art and culture, as he brought out, are naturally assimilative and contagious, and there are indeed "many points of affinity between the culture and the literature of the important communities inhabiting India."

It is well too that the need for something more than intellectual achievement was brought out. The moral aspect is too little stressed in modern education generally. Dr. Jayakar reminded his audience that university distinctions "could be no substitute for the spirit of sacrifice, the capacity to bear each other's burdens," but what our universities can and ought to do is to encourage the sense of responsibility and the open mind. The capacity to assimilate new ideas, which Dr. Jayakar urged university students to acquire, is vitally important, making bigotry impossible and conferring for individual enrichment "the seeds of rejuvenation" which should make the period of assimilation conterminous with life.

Inaugurating the Health Ministers' Conference on the 31st of August, Prime Minister Nehru struck some important notes, in right Gandhian style. Public health, he correctly said, "depended on more fundamental matters like food and housing than on drugs and medicines." He referred to the need for "the State paying more attention to measures of public health like sanitation, hygiene, etc." Gandhiji had always maintained that drugs and medicines were of less value than sanitation and the right physiological conditions. Not only of still less value are vaccines and serums; they are harmful and detrimental to the health of the people—that too Gandhiji asserted—though the Government seems to be spending large amounts and to be sponsoring questionable methods, like the B.C.G. Vaccine. How we should like to see Shrimati Amrit Kaur, an ardent devotee of Gandhiji, instruct the Department of Health under her charge to apply Gandhian ideas in health matters! In the name of science

and progress the medical profession and the health departments are acting most unwisely and delaying the health-building process so necessary for the Indian nation. They should be the first to learn Gandhiji's teachings on the subject of bodily health, diet and healing.

Both the Prime Minister and the Health Minister commented upon the Oriental and Occidental systems of medicine and rightly demanded a truly scientific (and, we would add, a fundamentally humanitarian) approach in the examination of any system. How very correct and charged with the Gandhian spirit was the Prime Minister's statement that

> to call the modern system of medicine "Western" was completely wrong, though the West had a great and dominant share in the recent past in its development. The system was based on generations of experience of India, Arabia and other countries.

It is considered patriotic nowadays to run down anything and everything which is not "indigenous" and it is not perceived that in the sphere of knowledge—scientific, philosophical and even religious—such an attitude is degrading to the individual and harmful to the nation. Truths about Spirit or Matter, God or Man, Soul or Body, are neither Eastern nor Western, ancient nor modern.

Another Gandhian note is to be found in the same speech. The need for co-operation with the Government is a duty of the citizen. Pandit Nehru said that

> while money was important for their schemes, it could not take them far unless they had public co-operation, understanding and individual morale.

This *individual* morale is at a very low ebb in the country today. The "human factor" is very important, but, it seems to us, very little is done to encourage personal initiative in public life and to call for personal co-operation from the citizen. Was it not the habit of Gandhiji to aid personal effort at improving the individual and thus raising the ethical standard in national life? Every citizen is creative or destructive, not only in the sense in which the economist uses those terms but also on the social and moral planes. The personal character of the citizen should be the concern not only of the Education Department, but of all departments—including, and especially, the Health Department.

The Sachchidananda Sinha Memorial Number of the half-century-old *Hindustan Review*, published a few months ago, is a deserved tribute to the founder-editor of that outstanding Indian monthly. Dr. Sinha had won distinction in other spheres than journalism. His critical study of the great Indian poet Iqbal, published a few years ago, marked the culmination of his literary career.

The Memorial Number contains 22 appreciative articles, headed by that of President Rajendra Prasad. Sir Syed Sultan Ahmad, Shri P. R. Das and Sir C. P. Ramaswami Aiyar are among the other distinguished contributors. It is a pleasing picture that they draw of a warm-hearted man, intensely alive to the end, a man of independent thought and action, a pioneer in social reform. Dr. Amaranatha Jha calls him "the last relic of a generation of intellectual giants." There are, besides, 24 pages of press tributes and condensed messages.